

been demonstrated in Winston-Salem, N.C.; Jacksonville, Fla.; and Chattanooga, Tenn. There are other cities where the programs move forward as well.

Equally important, however, is our unfulfilled responsibility to stimulate low-income rental housing for slum residents displaced by urban renewal and freeway construction programs. It is my hope that the Members of Congress, in both House and Senate, will act affirmatively to meet this challenge in the present 89th Congress.

I am convinced that our national view, as presently expressed does not adequately embrace the full potentialities of the highway program and its impact on the economic, the social, the recreational, and the esthetic considerations which are so necessary in our times. As we study in committee how to meet the increased costs of the Interstate System we're going to come to grips with these needs which I have mentioned. And so in the light of the projected growth of our population, the constantly increasing standards of living in America, and the critical role that automotive transportation occupies in our national concept and in our national economy, it is imperative, I believe—and the Congress recognizes it—that there is an area of activity and leadership for the Federal Government—in cooperation with State governments and with many segments of private industry as well.

Now I close with this expression of thanks to Bob Koch and his staff. I think that you have the right to know, ladies and gentlemen, that the membership of the Congress of the United States is appreciative of the counsel

of trained persons who understand your problems and the problems of other segments of industry and who come to the Congress and talk to us and counsel with us. I will say to you, President Koch, that you and your associates have never pressured the Congress of the United States.

Those of you in this industry—individually as well as through an excellent and adequate staff—come to your Congress. Let us hear from you. I think I have at least a right and responsibility tonight to say for all Members of Congress, that we want you to come to us before the fact, not after the fact. Give us the information which you have before hearings have gone too far—or at least until a bill has been reported from subcommittee or committee and then brought to the Senate or House floors for actual voting up or down—perhaps the adoption of sometimes hastily conceived amendments. You have done this, President Koch.

Chairman Meshberger, and to all you who are here, this isn't a pleasantry. I believe it's vitally important that you continue to give us earlier, rather than later, your counsel and guidance, as well as your support when you believe the cause is in the national interest.

As we move forward in these days and months and years ahead, workers in factory and field and farm—workers, yes, in Government—let us realize that tomorrow will be a good tomorrow as today has been a good today and yesterday was also good. And tomorrow will be a good tomorrow if we but know how to use it. And represented in this meeting are the leaders, as I have said, in

your industry who will help the Congress of the United States in its proper role to build a better America. Working together the task will be easier and surer of accomplishment.

## Public Issues Poll Results, Fourth District, Michigan

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

## HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 8, 1965

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, in February I polled the people of Michigan's Fourth Congressional District on several current issues, including medicare, Federal aid to education, the one-man, one-vote principle of apportionment, foreign aid, and our course in Vietnam. In round numbers, 140,000 questionnaires were distributed and 18,000 were returned—an unusually large percentage of response.

Replies were tabulated and compiled by an independent data processing firm in the Washington area. In order that the results may be known I include them at this point in the RECORD:

### Survey results

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No answer
1. Should Congress enact a compulsory system of hospital insurance (medicare) under the social security system?	25.2	71.9	2.9
2. Should the Federal Government furnish massive financial aid to primary and secondary schools?	33.2	63.4	3.4
3. If Federal aid to primary and secondary education is provided, do you feel that it should be given to parochial as well as public schools?	37.5	59.2	3.3
4. Do you favor repeal of excise taxes on furs, jewelry, and cosmetics?	32.2	64.6	3.2
5. Should the Federal excise tax on new cars (presently 10 percent of the purchase price) be repealed?	57.7	37.6	4.7
6. Due to the death of President Kennedy, the United States was without a Vice President from Nov. 22, 1963, to Jan. 20, 1965. Do you believe the President should be empowered to nominate a citizen to fill the vacancy, subject to approval of Congress?	69.9	26.9	3.2
7. After appointment by the President—and with approval of the Senate—Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court now serve "for good behavior"—in effect, a life term. In view of the increased political power being exercised by the Court, would you favor a constitutional change establishing a 12-year term for Justices?	77.6	19.5	2.9
8. In view of the present coin shortage and the comparative scarcity of silver, would you favor coinage of money from other metals, such as steel and aluminum?	34.2	59.9	5.9
9. Would you favor an increase in the Federal minimum wage (currently \$1.25 per hour) to \$2 per hour?	26.6	70.8	2.6
10. Would you favor a reduction in the standard workweek, from 40 to 35 hours?	26.7	70.7	2.6
11. Should the Federal Government require States to apportion both houses of their legislatures on a strict population basis?	32.2	62.3	5.5
12. Should the city and county governing boards (city councils and commissions, county boards of supervisors) be apportioned on the same, strict population basis?	33.3	58.9	7.8
13. Should our immigration laws be changed to provide for admission of aliens on the basis of their skills rather than the country from which they come?	51.2	40.4	8.4
14. In Vietnam which course do you advocate:	Percent		
Withdrawal of present military support?	17.5		
Advise the South Vietnam Government to seek a negotiated peace with the Vietcong?	41.9		
Further commitment of American men and materiel to an all-out campaign to rid South Vietnam of Communists?	24.8		
No answer	15.8		
15. Would you favor elimination of gold backing for U.S. currency?	10.9	80.4	8.7
16. This year we will be spending about \$3.25 billion on foreign aid. Do you feel this is—			
Too much?	78.6		
About right?	13.9		
Not enough?	1.3		
No answer	6.2		

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 9, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., quoted this verse of Scripture: Mark 6: 34: *And Jesus saw much people, and was moved with compassion toward them.*

Let us pray.

Most merciful and gracious God, grant that this Lenten season, in which there is so much internal and international

struggle and strife, we may center our thoughts upon our blessed Lord whose healing compassion alone is equal to our temporal needs and our immortal longings.

We thank Thee for our Master and Saviour who never looked upon the vast multitude with contempt or mere curiosity but with a tide of moving compassion as He thought of their aching hearts and bewildered minds.

The record of His life shows that He always sought to create within mankind a new spirit which would blossom and bear fruits in new desires and aspirations

in new endeavors and enthusiasms for the more abundant life.

Help us to receive the Lenten blessing that will cool our feverish anxiety and encourage us to carry on with those burdens and needs which perhaps no other mortal knows about and which are exclusively our own.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 45) entitled "An act to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank."

## AMERICA OUTRAGED BY SICKENING EVENTS IN ALABAMA

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, America is rightly outraged by Sunday's sickening events in the State of Alabama. And we in Congress should be equally outraged and awakened from our lethargic attitude toward complete protection of individuals be they in the sovereign country of South Vietnam or the sovereign State of Alabama.

The despicable actions of officials sworn to protect the rights of citizens serves only to strengthen the contention that the Federal Government must immediately end its timid approach to the racists who do not hesitate to rain their brutal clubs and whips on helpless men, women, and children.

I urge the President not to lend comfort to the likes of Governor Wallace by hesitancy in insuring the safety of Americans exercising their first amendment right to petition for redress of grievances. Past events in the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations have demonstrated that ample statutory authority exists for application of Federal force. However, if the President is convinced that no such authority can be applied in these situations, then I am prepared to join any of my colleagues in drafting legislation that would set up a special force of U.S. marshals whose sole purpose would be to step into situations where local law enforcement agencies either cannot or will not guarantee the safety of individuals.

There must be no timidity in deference to tyrants who hide behind a cloak of "States rights" or other overworked excuse for the oppression of minorities.

Our great country has largely overcome the bigots who in past years preyed on the Catholics, the Irish, the Italians, the Mormons, the Jews, and any other element that fell under ill-founded suspicion and fear. I urge our President to help us now to protect the brave citizens who today carry on the struggle for civil rights of Negroes in fulfillment of their total emancipation.

## THE CRISIS IN SELMA, ALA.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today at the close of business we are going to have a special order of 1 hour to address ourselves to a problem that continues to plague this country—the use of violence to deny American citizens their constitutional rights. The recent events in Selma, Ala., and most particularly those of last Sunday, are only the latest illustrations of this crisis situation.

During the last few weeks both nationwide and worldwide attention has been drawn to the violence and lawlessness which reigns in Alabama regarding the efforts of American citizens to gain their right to vote. Sunday we had a very brutal and glaring example of violence used to suppress another basic right of American citizens—the rights guaranteed by the first amendment to seek legal redress of grievances by exercising the constitutional rights of free speech and peaceful assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that a great number of my colleagues will be present at the close of business today to join in our expression of utmost concern over the crisis in Alabama. The people in our respective districts are already expressing their concern by both their words and actions. Surely we in this body should join with them so that the indignation over the tragedy of Selma may be clearly and forcefully expressed both throughout the country and also in this great Hall of the House of Representatives.

## AIRLINE FARES

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's newspapers, my attention was directed to two transcontinental airline advertisements. One paid for by American Airlines and its passengers utilized 190 inches of newspaper advertising space to make the point:

An Astrojet carries 124 passengers—we can't think of a single movie they'd all like.

The next was a 165-inch ad paid for by Trans World Airlines and its passengers with this caption:

How do you like your movies?—On a small television monitor and always in black and white or the way you see movies in the theatre on a big, wide screen, and color movies in color.

Obviously both airlines are overlooking the fact that the fundamental concern of the air traveler is safety, price, speed, and comfort in just about that order. Since current Civil Aeronautics Board regulations and methods eliminate price competition it appears that the airlines are again engaged in "en-

tertainment warfare." Frankly, if either of these airlines was allowed to reduce its fares by the cost of this nonsense, and reduce the round-trip rate without movies or selective stereophonic music, it would get all the business. Transportation is still the primary function of the airlines.

## PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Flood Control Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

## FEDERAL REGISTRATION OFFICES

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to again urge the President of the United States to mobilize the forces of the Federal Government to protect those who are only exercising their constitutional rights in Alabama. Federal troops should be dispatched immediately to protect those citizens, and the Justice Department should use its full and present powers to curb police brutality.

Congress must act to insure once and for all the right of every American citizen to vote, or admit segregationists are more powerful than constitutional principles.

The outrageous and shocking conduct of the Governor of Alabama and the brutality of the sheriff of Dallas County, have made clear the glaring inadequacy of the present civil rights laws to stop the disenfranchisement of American citizens.

Today I am introducing a voting rights bill which will cover all elections—local, State, and Federal. It would make it mandatory for the President to create Federal registration offices and to appoint Federal registrars where either the Commission on Civil Rights or the Federal district court finds that the right to register has been denied because of race, color, or national origin. The Federal registrars would issue certificates of registration and oversee elections.

This bill would completely eliminate literacy and constitution interpretation tests as well as poll taxes. Yesterday the Supreme Court correctly characterized these so-called literacy tests and other devices as traps—not tests.

The U.S. courts would be empowered to void any election—except a presidential election—in which registration certificates were not recognized and required to do so where 50 or more persons were denied the right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, immediate and effective legislation is necessary to make the right to vote a reality for all Americans. If the Civil Rights Commission can make

a finding requiring the President to appoint voting registrars, Federal judges such as Judge Cox will no longer be able to stand in the way of the fulfillment of the Constitution.

This afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I have obtained a special order to explain fully this bill.

#### SELMA, ALA.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Speaker, it was with disbelief that I witnessed on television the storm troopers in Selma walking over the defenseless citizens of that community.

How can we criticize totalitarian governments and their treatment of citizens when free Americans are brutalized as those in Selma were treated by the authorities?

How long can we permit this condition to continue? May we permit technical questions to interfere with the protection of our people? May we accept such excuses as have been offered for this brutality?

I call upon the President and the Attorney General to take appropriate action in the circumstances so that no longer will the shame of Selma hang over our heads.

As a law-abiding government, it is our obligation to make certain that lawlessness is treated the same wherever it occurs.

Where local governments are unable or unwilling to maintain order, it is incumbent upon the Federal authorities to take over.

Mr. Speaker, it must be apparent that that is the situation in Selma, Ala., today.

#### SELMA, ALA.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, events of the past 48 hours in the "no man's land" between Selma and Montgomery, Ala., have conclusively proved that the Governor and the government of the State of Alabama are morally and intellectually corrupt. They have proven that they are incapable of understanding American democracy and the responsibilities of American government.

It is presently being argued by constitutional lawyers and legal experts that there are or may be inhibitions on the intervention by the Federal Government in situations such as this, with Federal troop support or Federal marshal personnel. Frankly I doubt this, but I do offer one area of Federal action in which

the executive branch and the Congress have unquestioned authority. I have today called upon the President of the United States to forthwith close all military establishments in the State of Alabama. He has this power, and the Committee on Appropriations of this House has the authority with which to sustain those decisions. Among the establishments I have recommended to be closed are:

#### ARMY

Class 1 installations: Fort McClellan, Anniston, Ala.; Fort Rucker, Daleville, Ala.

Class 2 installations: Anniston Army Depot, Bynum, Ala.; Phosphate Development Works, Muscle Shoals, Ala.; Redstone Arsenal, Redstone Arsenal, Ala.

#### AIR FORCE

Brookley Air Force Base, Mobile, Ala.; Craig Air Force Base, Selma, Ala.; Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Ala.; Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Ala.

I am not suggesting this action as retaliation, but I am certain it will serve notice on other Governors and State officials that we will not support the economy or the local governments in those communities where elected public officials act from malicious passion and not reason.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION AUTHORIZING LIMITATION OF STATE DELEGATIONS

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, civil rights legislation has never been before a committee on which I have been a member, and I have refrained from making any remarks about it in all the years I have been here.

But what happened in Alabama on Sunday, it seems to me, would impel any American to speak up, and I am not going to speak up to ask that the President do something or that the administration do something. We ought to do it ourselves, because the Constitution says that any State which refuses a substantial majority of its citizens the right to vote shall have its delegation in the House cut down, and we ought to do what the Constitution says, what is our obligation and our moral right. We ought to cut the number of the Alabama delegation in half; and I am ready and willing to vote to do exactly that.

#### SELMA, ALA.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the outrage that has been committed in Selma,

Ala., by State and local officials violates conscience and the Constitution. I urge the President and the U.S. Department of Justice to take steps, which I believe are authorized, to protect the rights of Negroes in Alabama.

It is plain that the first amendment of the U.S. Constitution has been violated. The first amendment guarantees "the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances." This inalienable right, coupled with the 14th amendment, provides the basis for Federal jurisdiction. The 14th amendment is a prohibition against any State abridging the "privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States" and against denials by any State of "life, liberty, or property without the due process of law," or "the equal protection of the laws."

These constitutional provisions are reinforced by sections 1981 and 1983 of title 42 of the United States Code, and by section 332 of title 10, under which the President is authorized to intervene "whenever he considers that unlawful obstructions, combinations, or assemblages make it impracticable to enforce the laws of the United States by the ordinary course of judicial proceedings."

Mr. Speaker, the performance of police officials in Selma, Ala., clearly indicates that this was not just a local police problem but was rather a violent display of brutality against a peaceable assemblage and the right of free speech as guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution.

#### THE RIGHTS OF CITIZENSHIP

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, the basic rights of citizenship which are involved in the events transpiring in Selma, Ala., namely the right to register and to vote—have attracted the attention of the entire Nation. The denial of registration and voting rights is quite apparent to the Members of this House, as reported earlier by those who visited counties in Alabama where registration of Negroes has been substantially denied.

What could be more consistent with our fundamental American right of petition than that exercised by those who have organized and taken part in peaceable and nonviolent demonstrations? Those who have gathered and marched have caused no harm and, on the contrary, they have explained their problem in a dramatic, effective, and entirely peaceful way.

The brutality inflicted upon certain of these citizens by persons purporting to act as law-enforcement officers in Alabama is abhorrent to the consciences and morals of Americans everywhere. I protest this shocking display in behalf of an unlawful and unconstitutional end, and in disregard of the decency, respect, and good judgment which should be axiomatic with law enforcement officials under such circumstances.

I am proud to have sponsored legislation aimed at correcting the abuses which have clearly occurred in the denial of the right to register and to vote—H.R. 5409. In addition, I urge that the responsible citizens of Alabama insist upon recognition by their public officials of the rights of citizens of whatever color to peacefully assemble and demonstrate. If it appears—as it does appear today—that the local and State officials of Alabama are unable—or unwilling—to preserve and protect the rights of all of their citizens and all who are lawfully within their State then it is clearly incumbent upon the Federal Government to resort to such means as may be necessary to defend and protect those persons in the exercise of their inalienable rights of citizenship.

#### AMENDING THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 by the addition of certain provisions for injunctions against Communist organizations. This act may be cited as, "the Russian Organization Control Act of 1965 in the United States of America." This is the third time in as many Congresses that I have submitted this bill, Mr. Speaker. It changes the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 and, if as in the past (or as a precedent), it will be referred to the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It has been updated in view of recent findings and counterfindings of the Supreme Court of the United States, and I find it in order. It is high time that this or similar legislation was passed in order to solve our problems and in recognition of the situation inside this Nation.

I would commend to the distinguished chairman and the members of the Committee on Un-American Activities a serious consideration of this bill, and I hope that in this Congress we may consider it on the floor of the House. I further commend it to my colleagues in the House of Representatives and the Congress of the United States assembled.

#### HORTON RESOLUTION FOR HOUSE STAFF ID CARDS

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, at the opening of this session, we again were reminded of the need to strengthen and improve the security precautions in and around the House.

I understand that steps have been taken to enlarge the security force that is stationed at the five entrances to the Chamber of the House of Representatives. It is hoped that the addition of these security officers will serve to insure proper protection from pranksters and potentially dangerous individuals.

I wholeheartedly concur with these precautions; and in addition, I feel it would be useful to initiate an identification system for our staff members and for the staff employed by the House of Representatives.

This arrangement is not proposed with the idea of requiring an ID card to be displayed upon entering the Capitol buildings; rather, it would be helpful for a staff member to be able easily to identify himself should an emergency arise requiring a security officer to question him. As it now stands, our staff members have no ID card which quickly identifies them as employees of the House of Representatives or of a Member of Congress.

The provision of some kind of ID card would also be in line with the standard practice of many Government agencies who use this type of system to identify readily their respective employees.

Certainly, in view of the pressing need for increased security in the Capitol, a House ID card should be helpful to both the employee and the security officers in the House Chamber.

I respectfully urge that such a system be incorporated as soon as possible, and to that end I have introduced today a resolution authorizing cards of identification to be furnished on the request of any Member, the Speaker, any other elected officer of the House, or committee chairmen.

#### COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture have until midnight to file a report on the bill H.R. 5721.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### BASIC COMPENSATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 258) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 258

Resolved, That, effective March 1, 1965, there shall be payable from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, until otherwise provided by law, an amount which will permit the payment of basic compensation per annum, at a rate not in excess of the highest amount which, together with additional compensation authorized by law, will not exceed the maximum rate authorized by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, to the administrative assistant of each of the following:

- (1) the Speaker of the House;
- (2) the majority leader of the House;
- (3) the minority leader of the House;

- (4) the majority whip of the House;
- (5) the minority whip of the House;
- (6) each Member of the House who has served as Speaker of the House; and
- (7) each Member of the House who has served as majority leader, and as minority leader, of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### TRAGIC OUTRAGE IN SELMA, ALA.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, all Americans were shocked at the outrage perpetrated in Selma, Ala., when citizens seeking to peacefully demonstrate their grievances were met head on by a group of armed police and subjected to tear gas and police brutality. It is almost unbelievable that such an occurrence could happen in the year 1965, in the United States of America.

It is about time that the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States faced reality.

The reality is that almost every State in this Union is making a sincere effort in spite of local differences to conform to the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. One of the exceptions is the State of Alabama.

The Governor of Alabama has made it abundantly clear that he will not follow the law of the land and regrettably the political, spiritual, and civic leaders of Alabama are willing to let him get away with it. The time has come, in my judgment, when the Members of Congress from Alabama, when the clergy of Alabama, when the thinking people of Alabama should in unmistakable terms let the Governor and all who stand with him know that they are Americans first and as such want to obey the law of the land as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

It has now become abundantly clear by the occurrences in Selma, Ala., that the Federal Government must intervene. I have personally written to the Attorney General. I hope that positive, affirmative, and courageous action will be forthcoming from the Federal Government to make certain that there is no recurrence of the tragic outrage perpetrated in Selma, Ala., on Sunday.

#### SELMA, ALA.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the recent developments in Selma, Ala., fill one with a sense of shock and dismay.

Those who are prevented from voting because of race have justice and reason on their side. Nor should these persons be prohibited from peaceable assemblage in the drive to secure their constitutional rights.

The officials who contest this proposition are causing the shame and hopelessness of violence. How can this happen in a presumably civilized nation, ruled by law, where the individual is endowed intrinsically with God-given rights?

Developments point to the absolute necessity of new voting legislation to better protect persons denied this elementary prerogative. We have legislation now pending in the House, with which I am privileged to be identified; nothing should prevent swift deliberation and early enactment.

Moreover, if events move ever more precariously toward sustained lawlessness, the Federal Government—has the responsibility to protect innocent lives against the violence flowing from unlawful command.

I ask all competent authority to reappraise their obligation in the face of recklessness and the continued denial of rights to our Negro minority.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

#### [Roll No. 30]

Ashbrook	Greigg	Rogers, Tex.
Bandstra	Grider	Roosevelt
Belcher	Hagan, Ga.	Scheuer
Bennett	Hanna	Scott
Blatnik	Harsha	Shriver
Broyhill, Va.	Hollifield	Sikes
Clark	Holland	Steed
Diggs	Leggett	Teague, Tex.
Dyal	McDowell	Thompson, La.
Farnsley	Macdonald	Toll
Ford	Morse	Utt
Gerald R.	Multer	Widnall
Friedel	Nix	Willis
Gibbons	Powell	
Grabowski	Roberts	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KEOGH). On this rollcall 394 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2, DRUG ABUSE CONTROL AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 254) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that

the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to protect the public health and safety by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 254 makes in order consideration of H.R. 2.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to control and regulate the sale and distribution of "pep pills" and "goofballs" and a host of other depressant and stimulant drugs which, when abused, can poison the mind and generate dangerous antisocial behavior.

Mr. Speaker, in the other body, Senator DODD's Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency has, during the past 4 years, conducted extensive hearings on this subject. We are indebted to him for bringing the attention of the American public to the serious problem which now confronts us.

The illegal distribution of these drugs has reached astronomical proportions. We now count the unlawful sale of them in billions.

The most tragic aspect of this problem is that our youth are particularly susceptible to the temptation to use and abuse these drugs. In numerous instances crimes of violence have been perpetrated by teenagers and young adults under the narcotic effect of these drugs, and the use and abuse is not limited to youth from slum areas, it is also prevalent among the children of white-collar families.

In addition, it has been established that acute barbiturate poisoning is now the most common cause of death from any solid poison or any poison except carbon monoxide gas.

The widespread demand and the easy accessibility to large quantities of "pep pills" and "goofballs" and the inadequacy of the present law have resulted in a booming business not only for the drug manufacturers but also for the criminal element in our society.

This measure, among other things, imposes a recordkeeping and registration requirement on those involved in

the chain of distribution of these drugs. It makes the failure to keep records or permit inspection an unlawful act. It makes possession of these drugs a crime. It permits the Food and Drug Administration inspectors to carry firearms and gives them arrest and seizure powers. It imposes stiffer penalties for violation of the bill's provisions. This bill, however, is not a cure-all. It is a step in the right direction. It will provide Food and Drug authorities with more effective tools with which to combat this pressing problem, and it will to a considerable degree, confine the distribution of these drugs to legitimate channels of trade.

The bill has been unanimously reported from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and has also received the unanimous approval of the Committee on Rules.

The rule here provides for 4 hours of general debate under an open rule, and I urge the adoption of this rule, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 254 will provide an open rule with 4 hours of general debate for the consideration of H.R. 2, the bill entitled "Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965."

Mr. Speaker, the able gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] explained this bill in a very fine and thorough manner. I agree with his statements and associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, but I will say to the gentleman from New York that I do not have any requests for time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL].

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not take the floor at this time and congratulate Senator THOMAS DODD of Connecticut who has been a pioneer in this field. For the last 4½ years he and his committee have been making an intensive study and have an excellent report on this subject. I am well aware of the problem involved here because it confronts today the youth in the college areas of this country and we have a problem within our own city. I think the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is to be congratulated for this excellent report which I believe is a step in the proper direction virtually to curb the vicious drug peril which is sweeping the Nation.

I am happy to incorporate some of the remarks of the learned and capable Senator from Connecticut.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD ON INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO CONTROL THE DISTRIBUTION OF HABIT-FORMING BARBITURATES AND AMPHETAMINE DRUGS

Mr. President, on October 8, 1962, here on the floor of the Senate, I outlined my attempts over a 16-month period of the 87th Congress to obtain the passage of a piece of legislation which I consider vital to the welfare of our young people. I outlined the need for stronger Federal controls of the "dangerous drugs" by documenting the staggering increases in juvenile addiction to these so-called "pep pills" and "goofballs."

I proposed a bill that would make a series of the stimulant drugs subject to the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the barbiturate drugs were also included in this bill, as they are used illegally by juveniles in great quantities for purposes of chemically altering the nervous system. These drugs, the barbiturates, produce a habituation that is as severe and as self-destructive as the narcotic drugs.

While the solution to this problem is not easy, I felt that a giant stride toward a solution could be made by amending the law to make possible realistic law enforcement. The sale of these drugs without a prescription is already illegal, but no effective and organized attack on these illegal sales can be made unless law enforcement officials know exactly where and in what quantities these drugs are being produced and to whom they are being shipped for resale.

The provisions in my bill met this need by providing:

1. That manufacturers, compounders, and processors of barbiturates and amphetamines be required to register their names and addresses with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

2. That manufacturers and others engaged in receiving or disposing of such drugs be required to keep records of the quantities of such drugs they handle and make these records available to food and drug inspectors.

3. That adequate authority be given to drug inspectors to inspect establishments, inventory stocks, vehicles, and other facilities relevant to the proper investigation of the disposal of drugs.

In emphasizing the seriousness of the offense, I raised the penalties from the present \$1,000 fine and 1 year in jail to \$2,000 fine and 2 years in jail. In addition, I called for more severe penalties for repeaters and those found selling to children and teenagers.

In my October statement to the Senate, I presented the results of our hearings which were held in our two major population centers, Los Angeles and New York City, in which witness after witness in monotonous repetition told of the availability and abuse of these drugs in all sections of these cities, among all classes of people, and among all types of youth. In spite of my efforts as chairman of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, however, no action was taken on the proposed legislation in the 87th Congress.

I further stated that with the new Congress, I hoped to get a quick start toward the ultimate goal of final passage of this legislation without which this country will sacrifice thousands of our citizens to the living death of addiction. Thousands of others will die from overdoses or at the hands of crazed "pep pill" addicts.

There is one new provision in the bill I am introducing today as compared to the version I introduced in the 87th Congress. After further careful study of the barbiturate and amphetamine traffic as it exists throughout the country, the subcommittee took under advisement a provision to make possession of these drugs illegal. A recommendation to this effect was made to the committee by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, but the provision was not included in previous versions because I felt that a blanket possession provision might create an injustice to those who, daily, legitimately use these drugs. However, in the interim, we have developed new terminology which is designed to get at the illicit trafficker who has large quantities in his possession, while allowing the legitimate possessor of the barbiturate and amphetamine drugs to remain free from any possible difficulties with the law. I have, therefore, added a new section which will make possession of these drugs illegal, except if the drugs are for one's own use, for

the use of a member of his family, or for administration to pets and other animals.

As I pointed out in a previous plea for the passage of this drug control bill, the illegal use of the billions of these pills which have flooded this country, has reached epidemic proportions. During the 4 months of adjournment, this epidemic has apparently continued to spread throughout the country. The subcommittee in an effort to keep abreast of the spread of this infection communicated with the police chiefs of 128 of our major cities. Their replies to the subcommittee have more than substantiated what I have contended for the last 2 years:

The use of these drugs is increasing at a fantastic rate.

The use of these drugs has a direct causal relationship to increased crimes of violence.

The use of these drugs is replacing, in many cases, the use of the "hard" narcotics, such as opium, heroin, and cocaine.

The use of these drugs is more and more prevalent among the so-called white-collar youths who have never had prior delinquency records.

And something new has been added: The use of these drugs is increasingly identified as causes of heinous sexual crimes and perversions.

The illegal traffic in these drugs has created a sense of urgency on the part of responsible law enforcement officers, the great majority of whom urged the passage of the legislation which I introduce today.

To show each and every Member of the Senate that his own home State, its large cities, and its children are the victims of this illegal traffic in deadly drugs, I would like to refer to the responses of some police officials who communicated with the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee.

In identifying the types of crime that flow from the use of these drugs, the police chief of Boston, Mass., listed: "Homosexuality, automobile violations, prostitution, promiscuous sex behavior."

The police chief of Dallas, Tex., replied: "There has been a definite relationship between dangerous drugs and many arrests made for crimes of violence and sex perversion. The majority of known criminal offenders not using narcotic drugs or marihuana use some form of dangerous drugs."

The police chief of Salt Lake City, Utah, replied: "Individuals who have been arrested for a violation such as drunk driving, disturbing the peace, obscene conduct, or in some instances felonious assaults, we find later that their action was caused by the use of these drugs."

The police chief of Oakland, Calif., replied: "Automobile accidents; fighting; resisting arrest; wild parties; armed robberies; shootings; knifings; running berserk; hallucinations, and general effects seen in alcoholism."

And, finally, I would like to refer to the police chief of St. Louis, Mo., who told the subcommittee: "In the past 2 years we have noticed an increase in crimes, such as rapes and robberies in which the victim has been brutally beaten, cut, or shot, wherein the assailant was using or under the influence of the amphetamine drug."

I need not go on. I feel this documentation from areas representing widely different parts of this country are adequate testimony to the danger inherent in the abuse of these drugs.

We also learned from our correspondents the extent of the increases in the "dangerous drug" traffic, as evidenced by the yearly increases in arrests from 1958 to 1962. The information they provided gives further evidence of the surging nature of this illegal traffic. Before quoting these figures, I would like to remind my colleagues that competent police witnesses who testified before our subcommittee estimated that only 1 and certainly no more than 10 percent of the dan-

gerous drug violations ever come to the attention of the police. If this is so, the figures I am about to recite assume menacing connotations.

We were told that in Seattle, Wash., from 1961 to 1962, there was a 30-percent increase in dangerous drug arrests.

In Dallas, Tex., over the same period, there was an 18-percent increase. Dallas, I might add, has more arrests for this offense than any of the responding cities. Since 1958, this community has experienced a 72-percent increase in dangerous drug arrests.

San Francisco, Calif., recorded a 76-percent increase in arrests between 1961 and 1962.

Between 1958 and 1962, Oklahoma City recorded a 59-percent increase.

Other areas, inexperienced with this new plague, while not recording high arrest rates, did experience dramatic increases in the numbers of police contacts relating to the dangerous drug traffic. For example, the police chief of the city of Detroit told the subcommittee: "Since 1958, the Narcotic Bureau has processed hundreds of prisoners arrested for violation of the dangerous drug law, but were unable to prosecute due to a questionable arrest or youthfulness of the defendant."

As far as the legislation I am proposing is concerned, I would like to point out that the deadly "heroin," the preferred drug of addicts until recently, is outlawed from its inception. It has no value except to the underworld and it is there that its creation and distribution is planned and executed.

However, the amphetamines and barbiturates are legitimate drugs. From testimony taken at previous hearings, we on the Subcommittee were convinced that the primary source of "dangerous drugs" that eventually ended up in the illegal market were siphoned off from legitimate channels. The traffic, in effect, was due to a breakdown in controls between legitimate producers, wholesalers, retailers, and physicians. The replies to our recent inquiry confirmed this testimony.

There were indications of other more ominous trends in the dangerous drug traffic over the past several months.

As with the historical development of the traditional narcotics addict such as the heroin user, the use and abuse of these drugs is being adopted to a great degree by the criminal element in our large cities. I contend that this development will cause even greater increases in crime of violence, aggression, assault, homicide, and rape.

From the police chief of Portland, Oreg., we learned that: "Traffic and use by underworld characters has vastly increased in this area in the past few months. Such usage is now largely confined to the old narcotic users, and underworld characters; however, we already have indications that such usage of dangerous drugs is spreading to other groups including college students and juveniles."

From this statement, I think it is apparent that, as with heroin, the criminal element is looking, and finding, juveniles and youths who will support the adult criminal's habit and, indeed, make him a profit.

As with the "hard narcotics," we can look forward to a whole new underworld in "dangerous drugs" rising if corrective measures are not taken quickly. The techniques used by the heroin pusher of proselytizing new users and creating a larger and larger market will be used with equal vigor by the "dangerous drug" peddler.

That this is a problem of direct and increasing effect on our youth population was confirmed by the police chief of Seattle, Wash., who told the subcommittee: "It is my opinion that there is a decided upsurge in the traffic in dangerous drugs. These violations create a whole new set of circumstances of which our present laws to curtail violations are inadequate. I believe this problem to be here to stay and it is closely correlated

to the narcotic problem. It creates new addicts of the worst sort, primarily among the younger set, and a large majority of them will be hardened addicts in the future. Penalties have to be stiffened in some way to curtail the dealers in their lucrative venture."

My colleagues from the State of Florida will be interested to hear that the police chief of Miami, in endorsing the need for remedial legislation, told the committee: "We feel that these drugs are so dangerous that the sale and manufacture of them should be controlled in the same manner as are narcotics. Our biggest problem is the control and check from the manufacturer to wholesaler to retailer. Many times there are no invoices to show how many capsules or pills were purchased at these levels."

I think the point has been made by these professional people in the field of crime and delinquency control: The dangerous drug problem is with us; it is growing, and it is acute.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the inaction that so persistently dogged my efforts to obtain passage of this legislation in the last Congress will not manifest itself in the 88th Congress. As I pointed out in October 1962, everyone from the President to the law enforcement officer on the sidewalk, from the large drug companies to the representatives of every segment of the field of pharmacy, has supported this legislation.

On November 20, 1962, the new Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Anthony J. Celebrezze, said that two areas of legislation would receive top priority attention from his Department, one of which is the development of stronger controls over the distribution and sale of the amphetamine and barbiturate drugs. I know that Secretary Celebrezze will back the legislation which I am introducing today as it was a cooperative effort between his people and our subcommittee that resulted in the bill I am proposing.

With this tremendous and obvious need, with the overwhelming backing for this legislation, and with the support of the 88th Congress, I feel that there is no reason why we cannot obtain swift passage of the amendment which I and my colleagues are proposing. I, therefore, commend this new bill, the "Barbiturate and Stimulant Drug Control Amendment of 1963" to the attention of the Senate, and I pray that it will be given the immediate and urgent attention which the problem demands.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### DRUG ABUSE CONTROL AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2) to protect the public health and safety by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 2, with Mr. MOORHEAD in the chair.

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

(By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce brings to the House today a bill commonly referred to as the Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965.

We consider that this is one of the most important proposals for the consideration of this House and of the entire Congress. This bill deals with the abuse of certain drugs that are today causing serious problems throughout the United States. It is designed to provide positive controls over a situation which is widespread throughout this great Nation of ours. The bill establishes measures that would enable the Food and Drug Administration to run down diversions of these drugs from legitimate channels of trade and, by pinpointing the areas of diversion, dry up the illegitimate traffic in these drugs.

We are living in a period when great and important advances are continually being made in all areas of science, particularly in the field of medicine. The pharmaceutical manufacturing industry of the United States, considered as a whole, is the most progressive industry of its type in the world. I say this as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, and not just to brag about what we are capable of doing in this country and what we have accomplished in this important field in the interest of humanity and of improving the health, the welfare, and the lot of our people. The progress that is made each year is amazing.

Mr. Chairman, every year this industry produces numerous drugs that save lives, relieve pain, promote the well-being of our citizens, and aid in promoting the health of all of us.

Mr. Chairman, there are many problems that we are facing today, but one problem that faces us is the fact that many of these new drugs have what is commonly referred to as side effects. There are some people who take drugs because of their side effects—because of the way the drug affects their minds as well as their bodies.

In recent years, Mr. Chairman, there has grown up in this country a widespread pattern of abuse of certain drugs which are relatively recent discoveries. You know, it is amazing that people who are blessed with a mind that permits the individual to make judgments, will take substances that affect that capacity to make judgments, ignoring what they will do to his body and to his mind and ultimately to our society and civilization. But, yet, there are people, many more than there should be, who knowing of these side effects and what they will be, persist in indulging in the use of them.

Mr. Chairman, we know the story of narcotics down through the years—the use of opiates of various kinds such as marijuana, heroin, morphine, and the like—and how their use has affected our society.

Mr. Chairman, medical science has done a lot; it has given to the people of this country the greatest blessings of life of any civilization or society in the history of mankind. We are fortunate that we are blessed with having the kind of people who can develop that which is necessary to preserve and protect the health of the country. But we should also readily understand and quickly admit what will happen to us if these blessings that we enjoy are abused.

Mr. Chairman, barbiturates have only been on the market for about 50 years. It is possible to get drunk on these drugs and unfortunately many of our people use them for that purpose and for that purpose only.

Amphetamines have been on the market a much shorter period of time and, likewise, it is unfortunate that many people take amphetamines simply to obtain kicks.

Now, let me explain, as we proceed with this debate, when we refer to barbiturates we are talking about a drug having a depressant effect on the central nervous system. A lot of people call them goof balls.

The amphetamines are central nervous system stimulants. They are very widely used in medical practice, primarily to combat a wide variety of mild depressive states. Amphetamines are very similar in their chemical structure to adrenalin, which is a substance manufactured by our own bodies to serve as a stimulant when we are frightened or angry. The amphetamines have a somewhat similar effect on the body and can be used to combat fatigue, to make a person feel alert, and to make a person feel somewhat happier. Because of this effect, amphetamines are widely distributed through illegal channels in the United States for sale to persons who want to combat the effects of fatigue. Amphetamines are sold illegally at a number of truck stops throughout the United States, and are used by truck drivers who are taking long trips, and traveling more hours than they should under regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission. There have been numerous accidents involving the misuse of amphetamines. What happens is that a person taking amphetamines manages to mask his feeling of fatigue and continues to take these drugs while working until he reaches a point where, although he may still feel alert, his body has been driven beyond the point of endurance. He then collapses and may sleep for some 24 to 48 hours. If an individual reaches this point of collapse while driving a truck at high speed on the highway, the results are obvious.

There are instances where individuals who take amphetamines in large quantities and remain awake for long periods of time ultimately begin to have hallucinations. They see things that are not there. When this happens to a man driving a car or a truck, it frequently leads to traffic accidents.

I have been told that there are some instances where persons using amphetamines go as much as 100 hours or more

without sleep, then they collapse, and sleep 1 or 2 days straight.

Amphetamines are also abused by persons who take them just for kicks. They take amphetamines for the purpose of getting high. While in this state, the individuals involved sometimes commit crimes that they would never commit except for the influence of the drug. For example, just a few weeks ago, three young hoodlums out in Chicago, while under the influence of amphetamines, murdered the owner of a grocery store while committing a robbery. They told the police that while pumping 11 bullets into this defenseless man, they were "laughing like crazy." The reports of police departments throughout the country are filled with cases where people who are hopped up on amphetamines committed unusual crimes.

Another problem affecting the public health and safety arising out of the abuse of amphetamines is that persons become dependent on these drugs.

We have all heard of the withdrawal symptoms that a narcotics addict suffers when the drug he has become hooked on is not available. The amphetamines do not cause withdrawal symptoms of this type; however, an individual who has become accustomed to the feeling of well-being that he gets from taking amphetamines comes to crave this feeling. He becomes dependent on the drug and although he does not have physical withdrawal symptoms and although his body does not demand the drug, his personality is so dependent upon it that he has to have the drug. The term the doctors use to describe this situation is "psychic" dependence. Although I do not want to get too technical about this, I should point out that the World Health Organization has an expert committee on addiction producing drugs. This committee has developed standards for classifying the different types of drug dependence. One of these types is drug dependence on the amphetamine type, which is defined as a state arising from repeated administration of amphetamine or an agent with amphetamine like effects on a periodic or continuous basis. Its characteristics include:

First. A desire or need to continue taking the drug;

Second. Consumption of increasing amounts, accompanied in some measure by the development of tolerance for the drug;

Third. A psychic dependence on the effects of the drug; and

Fourth. General absence of physical dependence.

Another class of drugs which is subject to widespread abuse is the barbiturates. The barbiturates have, in some respect, an opposite effect from the amphetamines, and in other respects, a similar effect. The barbiturates are central nervous system depressants. In other words, they will put you to sleep, whereas, the amphetamines will pep you up. Barbiturates are widely prescribed by doctors to calm patients down or to help them to sleep. Unfortunately, however, a person can get drunk by taking

barbiturates, so that they are widely used for nonmedical purposes mostly by people who take them because they want to get drunk.

A person who is taking excessive quantities of barbiturates will become drowsy and confused and unable to think clearly. These drugs affect a person's emotional balance, and if a person has some underlying hostility, it may well come out while he is under the influence of barbiturates and he may exhibit considerable hostility to others. A person under the influence of barbiturates is obviously as great a threat on the highway as the alcoholic. He is also a threat to other members of society.

The person who abuses barbiturates is also a very great threat to himself. Individuals who take barbiturates in excessive quantities develop a tolerance for this drug and need to take ever increasing amounts. Excessive quantities of barbiturates can kill a person, because they depress the central nervous system to such an extent that it ceases to function to the extent necessary to keep a person's heart beating, so he dies.

Repeated taking of barbiturates can lead to physical dependence as well as the psychic dependence involved in amphetamines. In other words, a person who is taking barbiturates in excessive quantities can become "hooked" so that his body requires the drug, and if it is withdrawn from him he may have convulsions, and even die. In other words, a person who takes barbiturates will develop a psychic dependence so that his personality requires the drug and, in addition, he is likely to develop a physical dependence as well.

In 1963, President Kennedy appointed a Commission to study the problems of narcotics and drug abuse under the chairmanship of Judge E. Barrett Prettyman. The other members of the Commission were Mr. James P. Dixon, James R. Dumpson, Roger O. Egeberg, Harry M. Kimball, Austin MacCormick, and Rafael Sanchez-Ubeda. This Commission issued a unanimous report in November 1963, which went into all these problems and recommended legislation along the lines of the bill which we bring to the House today insofar as it concerns barbiturates, amphetamines, hallucinogens, and other dangerous drugs.

The Commission described drug abusers as follows:

Who becomes a drug abuser? Most known drug abusers in the United States are in the lower social and economic levels of our society. They are the frustrated, the hopeless, and the maladjusted. They fear or resent society and seek to escape from it and from its pressures. In large part they are concentrated in a few large metropolitan areas.

Some use drugs to seek relief from the tedium of their jobs and their lives. Some talented, even brilliant, individuals take to drugs to escape the fear of failure, or the knowledge that they have not fulfilled their potential. Some become "hooked" accidentally when they find themselves unable to give up the drug after undergoing medical treatment with one or more of these drugs to relieve pain. A large number take to certain drugs to offset fatigue, and this group includes truckdrivers, theatrical people, and even doctors and nurses facing the letdown that follows long hours of tension. A very

much larger group try psychotoxic drugs for "kicks," out of curiosity or bravado. They are usually juveniles who frequently find themselves unable to shake off the drug habit.

There is great ignorance of the patterns of drug abuse. The practice of drug addiction appears to be spread by the users themselves. The immediate physiological craving associated with withdrawal from narcotic drugs can now be alleviated by medical treatment. Because the original underlying psychological causes persist, however, the relapse rate following withdrawal from drugs is very high.

I have described so far in considerable detail the problems faced by our society arising out of the misuse of these drugs under discussion. Now, what do we propose to do about it?

Two years ago, the Subcommittee on Public Health and Safety was conducting hearings on a proposed reorganization of the Public Health Service. During those hearings, Commissioner Larrick, of the Food and Drug Administration, was asked about the misuse of barbiturates and amphetamines in the United States. He wrote the subcommittee, in answer to its request, that he had surveyed the drug industry in the United States, and discovered that they were manufacturing 9 billion barbiturates and amphetamines annually. Commissioner Larrick estimated that at least half of these drugs found their way into illicit channels of distribution. In other words, 4½ billion of these pills are being bootlegged annually today.

We received testimony during the hearings from a psychiatrist who conducted a very unusual research program, financed in part through funds from the National Institutes of Mental Health, who interviewed pushers and users of these drugs in one area of the country. He told us that in a community of one-half million people, there were probably as many as 5,000 persons whose lives centered around taking these drugs. In other words, 1 person out of 100 today is in a situation, at least in this area, where for all practical purposes he is lost to our society. His life centers around taking barbiturates or amphetamines, and his only aim in life is to continue receiving the supply of these drugs.

To obtain the money to buy them, the individual involved must turn to crime since his life habits are such that he cannot keep a job.

The problem is not, of course, confined to this one area. The testimony we have received indicates that it is nationwide. It occurs in our large cities and it also occurs in our small towns.

The problem we face today arises, in large measure, out of the fact that these drugs are so freely available. They are freely available for a number of reasons, none of which reflect credit on any of the persons involved. These drugs are sold to persons in the illegal traffic by some pharmaceutical manufacturers, by some wholesalers, by some retail pharmacies, and by some doctors. Of course, as is always true, the persons engaged in illegal distribution are a small minority, but in the case of these drugs, this small minority is causing a very big problem. In addition, large quantities of these

drugs are stolen from legal channels of commerce and find their way into the bootleg traffic. Large quantities are manufactured illicitly. It is not as simple to manufacture these drugs as it is to make gin in a bathtub, but it is possible for a person with a sophisticated knowledge of chemistry to manufacture these drugs himself relatively easily.

The bill which we have before the House today is designed to curtail this illegal traffic in these drugs. We do not, by any means, intend by this legislation to hamper or curtail in any way the proper use of these drugs in the practice of medicine. These drugs are very useful in medical practice. What we are trying to do is to keep these drugs available only for legitimate medical uses.

This bill is a strong bill, a good bill, and one that we think will work. It imposes a few controls over the industry as possible, while still providing machinery for regulation to the extent necessary.

I am including at this point an editorial from the El Dorado Daily News that points up the need for this bill:

#### NARCOTICS ON CAMPUSES

Reports from a number of U.S. college campuses in recent days that narcotics are being used by students, in as yet undetermined numbers, is of concern to the Nation because of the implication that these are not isolated occurrences.

Is it merely coincidence that Harvard, Cornell, the University of Massachusetts, and Brandeis have all reported specific instances of marihuana use by their students in recent weeks, and that other universities and colleges are also investigating suspected incidences of narcotics use on their campuses?

Some college officials would like to brush it off as just a student prank, and of course that is all it may be—at the beginning. But narcotics have a way of sticking with the user far beyond the original contact.

Narcotics use generally is reported to be rising in the United States, largely due to a growing international traffic in narcotic weeds. Mainly, the weeds originate in Red China and Latin America. China encourages the exportation of marihuana and opium to the United States as one means of breaking down the moral fiber of the Nation.

New York City is the illicit narcotics center in the United States, and it is not surprising to learn many of the colleges and universities which have uncovered narcotics peddling on their campuses are within a short distance of New York. In fact, the availability of marihuana has become so enlarged some students at Harvard estimate one-fifth to one-half the student population experiments with the drug before leaving the campus.

If this estimate is correct, it is obvious educators—not only at Harvard—have a major task on their hands to educate students about the great harm they are inflicting on themselves. The task is made more difficult because of the widespread use of pep pills, or nerve stimulants, on campuses as an aid in staying alert during long hours of study and examination. To the student, it may seem only one short step from these pills to marihuana.

The rash of narcotics discoveries has alerted campus authorities to one of the most serious threats they have faced. Educating those who might be tempted to the dangers is one overdue weapon the schools should begin to employ immediately.

This is not a bill that was developed suddenly and without long and careful consideration. This is a problem that

has developed over the years and this legislation has been developed over a period of time in consultation with many people. So if anyone gets the idea that anybody is to be given special credit, let me say there have been enough people working on this legislation for all of us to get credit for. There are a lot of people responsible for this legislation that has been so carefully prepared and considered and brought to you by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is well known that we have considered this problem in previous Congresses, over the years, and certain phases of the problem in connection with other legislation.

In addition to the consideration by our committee, there are many organizations that have given a lot of thought and study to this matter, as well as people in the Departments. Even though I have been quite critical of the Food and Drug Administration over some phases of the administration of the Food and Drug Act, I must commend them for their diligence and for their determination and for their continued advocacy of amendments to bring about the kind of machinery that is needed in order to meet this problem.

Commissioner Larrick is a fine man. He is a good administrator. He is an able administrator. He has many fine and able people, working under him. Even though, as I say, I have been somewhat critical of some of their administrative actions, I have the highest commendation for their sincerity and for their efforts.

This legislation has a long history. A number of years ago, a subcommittee chaired by Hon. HALE BOGGS held hearings on this subject, along with hearings on the general problem of narcotic and drug abuse, and recommended that illicit traffic in barbiturates and amphetamines be handled by the Food and Drug Administration. Bills dealing with this subject have been introduced over the years since, and last Congress legislation passed the other body dealing with this subject. At the time this legislation passed, a great deal of pressure was brought to bear on the committee to pass this legislation immediately. The bill was, to put it frankly, very controversial, and in order to deal with the problems involved in it, we would have had to hold very full hearings. It was late in the session and our committee was unable to schedule hearings at that time; however, I announced that legislation dealing with this subject would be the first order of business of our committee during the 89th Congress, if I was still chairman.

During the adjournment period, this bill was worked out and hearings began on it on January 27. I might point out to my colleagues in the House, that this is the earliest date on which legislative hearings had begun during the first session of a Congress by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee during the entire time I have been chairman.

This bill was acceptable in principle to everybody. Some disagreement was expressed as to some of the details of the legislation; however, all testimony re-

ceived was favorable to it. The hearings, however, extended over 7 days. Five of our colleagues testified before the committee: the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH]. The American Medical Association, which had opposed the legislation in the form presented in the 88th Congress, appeared and strongly supported this bill; the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, the National Association of Retail Druggists, the American Pharmaceutical Association, the American Trucking Association, and several public witnesses testified in favor of the legislation, although in some instances, there were reservations expressed as to detail.

Our committee considered this legislation in four executive sessions extending over 3 days and we ordered the bill reported unanimously.

So we have developed a very good record which is printed for your use and information, and I call it to your attention.

Mr. Chairman, we bring to you with this kind of record this bill which in our judgment is a good bill. It is a strong bill, and I believe it will do a lot toward meeting the problem.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. A great many members have asked me how extensive is the addiction and use of amphetamines and barbiturates. Can the gentleman expand on that?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. I was going to talk on that. I wanted first to give the background of the legislation. I was going to go into that and talk about some of the things that disturbed the gentleman from Illinois and me and everyone else who listened to the story.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. During the last year there were 9 billion doses or pills or capsules of this class of drugs produced by the pharmaceutical manufacturers—9 billion in the last year. Now these are supposed to go into legitimate channels from the manufacturer who is registered with the Food and Drug Administration to the wholesaler and from the wholesaler to the distributor—say the druggist, as an example—and to some physicians who distribute this type of drug.

Four and one-half billion doses or pills or capsules, it is estimated—that is 50 percent of these drugs produced by the manufacturers in this country went into the illicit market.

In other words, there are so many avenues by which these drugs get to our people—some through legitimate means and others through illegitimate means—and the illicit traffic has become so great in this country that it has brought about a dangerous situation to our society.

We had information as to the teenagers of the country—schoolgirls and schoolboys and athletes. I was advised

about an entire football team that, in order to win, used this kind of drug to give them the pep, or to give them the kick, so that they could win their game. That occurred prior to last fall.

There was an outstanding researcher who came from Oklahoma City, who conducted research in Oklahoma City and the surrounding area. What occurred was astounding. That fine young doctor, Dr. John Griffith, a psychiatrist, did a terrific job, and he is to be complimented for it. He made his way not only to those who used the drugs, but also to the "pushers" and wholesalers. He got their confidence, and they would invite him to their meetings and to their parties. They explained to him what their lives were like, and the pushers explained how they went about making a living out of distributing these drugs to people.

We learned from this and from other sources, from people who had done research, that drug abuse occurred at all levels, not only among the youngsters and teenagers, but also among adults.

One of the areas where these drugs are abused is in the motor carrier industry, particularly the trucking industry. Truckdrivers all over this Nation, at certain filling stations—the type they call truck stops—are able to purchase amphetamines. We received letters from many people, even from wives of truck drivers, pointing out what was happening to their homes and was was happening to their families.

This is the kind of information we developed, and there was a great deal of it. The record is full.

Some Members may have seen the CBS television program. It was in two sections of 30 minutes each, in the latter part of last year.

Together with a member of our staff, I went to New York. We went to the man who worked the program up. His name is McMullen. He showed us the firm, as he did for the committee. We asked him to come here.

In order to show what could be done, to show how easy it would be, he went into the business in New York City. He just opened up an office right in the heart of the city. He put a sign up with the name of the company, got some stationery, opened a bank account, hired a couple of secretaries, and went into the business.

He got the addresses of manufacturers and wrote 27 of them, asking that they send him an order. He had responses from 17. Five of those happened to be in the immediate area, and he knew he would get caught right away, so he brushed them aside and ordered from others in the interior of the country, where the others were. Within the course of a few weeks he had accumulated, solely by opening up an office in the heart of New York City, over a million of these pills. The entire lot cost him about \$600. The value of these pills in the illegal market was at least a quarter of a million dollars.

He spent \$600 opening up an office and within a matter of a few weeks he had enough of these drugs on hand so that if he would have gone on out into the illegitimate traffic, as so many have been

going, he would have had at least \$250,000 in profits, just like that.

Now, these are facts, and I am doing this in order to show to this House and to the Congress how serious this problem is, and to point out how important it is that we should disseminate this information among the public and the people of the United States so that they can become aware of what is happening to us.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just took time to eat a sandwich and I missed the gentleman's earlier remarks. The gentleman was not speaking of Bobby Baker, was he?

Mr. HARRIS. No, I did not have Mr. Baker in mind. If there is any information whatsoever about anyone that is being discussed by another committee of this Congress outside of this body, then I have no information on that. That name has never come up in it, and I would say to the gentleman that this is too serious a problem to inject frivolous things into it.

Mr. GROSS. Is Bobby Baker frivolous?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I could go on giving you more information which was developed at the hearings, but I have tried rather fully to answer the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think it would be well to point out that a lot of people have been asking, "What is the effect in my community?" I think the testimony developed that in a community of, let us say, 5,000 to 10,000 to 15,000 people there could be as many as 100 people addicted to the use of these two drugs. I was rather surprised that here in the Greater Washington metropolitan area, according to the figures developed at the hearings, there may be as many as 20,000 people in this area of some 2 million people who were in the regular habit of using these drugs. That is the prevalence of it nationwide, I believe. No community has been exempted from its effect. These pushers and peddlers and sellers and solicitors of all kinds have not missed any community in this country.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct. Of course, we have no information about precise numbers in any locality. Dr. Griffith, the research specialist that I referred to, commented on that, saying that he could not give us the numbers of total users, but I think the record did show in the area he researched there was an estimate of 5,000 they knew of that used these drugs promiscuously. The gentleman is correct that you cannot single out any community in this country. Communities over the entire Nation are subjected to the same kind of abuse. Therefore, there needs to be a nationwide effort on the

part of everyone to carry out what many people have been striving for for a long time. What has now developed out of this legislation is, in my judgment, a very good approach to the problem.

I wonder how many Members of this House read the article recently in Life magazine that dealt with this subject.

It was a rather astounding narration of the experience of a particular couple who became addicted to drugs; and beyond the effect on their own bodies and minds, the story told of how they would impose on other people, how they would steal, burglarize, and use any kind of method in order to obtain this kind of drug to give them what they thought they should have. That is the action of a narcotic addict. So this problem is that kind of problem and we should deal with it and deal with it strictly. That is what we are trying to do now.

The problem is not confined to any one area, as we have made clear to you today. It arises in large measure from the fact that the drugs are so easily available. What we are trying to do today, is to tighten up the procedures. The bill which we have here is designed to curtail this illegal traffic.

We do not interfere with legitimate distribution and use. We do not by any means intend to hamper or curtail in any way the proper uses. These drugs are very useful in medical practice. What we are trying to do, and seek to do, is to keep these drugs available for legitimate medical uses but to curtail the illicit traffic.

The bill would impose as few controls on the industry as the committee found practicable to develop. At the same time, we want to provide the machinery for regulation to the extent it is necessary to reach the problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Primarily, this bill is a recordbreaking bill. Every drug manufacturer today is required to be registered with the Food and Drug Administration. The bill will require that wholesalers register with the Food and Drug Administration. Every person who manufactures these drugs and every person who sells them at wholesale is required by the bill to inventory all supplies of these drugs on hand after the effective date of this bill which, in general, is 7 months after the date of enactment and thereafter to keep complete and accurate records for not less than 3 years showing all sales of these drugs.

Retail pharmacies are required to keep records of these drugs which may be separate records if the pharmacist chooses, and all these records kept by manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers are subject to inspection by the Food and Drug Administration. In addition, those few physicians who dispense these drugs from their offices for a fee are also required to keep records subject to inspection by the Food and Drug Administration.

The bill requires recordkeeping by all persons engaged in the chain of distribution of these drugs, from the supplier of the manufacturer down to the ultimate

retailer, and makes these records subject to inspection by the Food and Drug Administration. No person who today is in the legitimate chain of distribution of these drugs or their components will be hurt by this bill so long as his operations are legal. The inspections that are authorized are for the purpose of enabling the Food and Drug Administration to pinpoint the areas of diversion of these drugs, and the suppliers of the bootleg traffic.

The bill provides:

No separate records, nor set form or forms for any of the foregoing records, shall be required as long as records containing the required information are available.

The purpose of this provision is to insure that the business records kept by legitimate businessmen will be considered as adequate records for the purpose of this legislation.

One of the important provisions contained in the bill to aid in its enforcement is a prohibition against possession of these drugs except for use by the possessor or members of his household, or for administration to an animal owned by him or a member of his household. This legislation does not make it a Federal crime for an individual to abuse these drugs. This provision is consistent with the recommendations of the President's Commission.

The purpose of the possession provision is to provide the Food and Drug Administration with an added enforcement tool which can be used against persons in the bootleg traffic. Possession of quantities of these drugs by an individual who proposes to sell them to others is made an offense under the Food and Drug Act, punishable by fine of \$1,000 or up to a year in jail for the first offense, and 3 years imprisonment or \$10,000 fine for a second or subsequent offense. The sale of these drugs outside of legitimate channels of commerce is also made a criminal offense subject to the same penalties. However, if the sale is made by an adult to a minor, the bill provides that the fine may be up to \$5,000 or imprisonment up to 3 years, with a penalty for a second or subsequent offense being a fine of \$15,000 or up to 6 years in prison or both.

The bill provides for inspection of records, and makes it an offense punishable by fine or imprisonment to refuse to permit inspection.

At the present time the Food and Drug Administration has 939 inspectors who conduct inspections of all of the plants and establishments in the United States where foods, drugs, cosmetics or therapeutic devices are manufactured, as well as at places where they are processed, packed or held. This means that the agency is spread pretty thin because of the large number of inspections required to adequately protect the public health and safety.

During the last fiscal year, about 56 of these inspectors were assigned to investigations involving barbiturates and amphetamines. The bill creates a substantial increase in the number of these inspectors so as to deal adequately with the problems involved in drug abuse.

In addition, the bill greatly expands today the authorities of the agents of

the Food and Drug Administration who will be dealing with barbiturates and amphetamines and counterfeit drugs. Today, agents of the Food and Drug Administration do not have the power to make arrests; they are not authorized to carry firearms, and they cannot make seizures. These powers are not necessary as a general rule for the adequate enforcement of the Food and Drug Act; however, in the case of individuals involved in the illicit traffic in barbiturates and amphetamines, the lack of these powers greatly hamper the agency. We want to be sure that this traffic is dried up to the extent that it is possible to do so, and the committee has, therefore, provided in the legislation that agents of the Food and Drug Administration who are engaging in investigations involving barbiturates and amphetamines and other covered drugs, and counterfeit drugs, may carry firearms, execute search warrants and arrest warrants, make arrests for offenses committed in their presence, or make arrests for felonies where they have probable cause to believe that the person has committed a felony, and detain goods temporarily prior to the actual institution of formal seizure proceedings.

This bill would require accurate and complete records to be kept. There are those who say this Government of ours should not make us do that. But let us take, as an example, the manufacturer. He keeps records for his own use, not only in connection with distribution, but for other purposes.

Let us take the wholesaler. He is free now to do anything he wants to. We know he keeps records. He has kept records for his own use, for tax purposes and otherwise. This requires him to register with the Food and Drug Administration in order that we can keep up with what is going on in this field. That is no extra burden, notwithstanding the complaints that some of us have received.

There is the druggist. The pharmacists have a deep feeling about this legislation. I have been very determined in the past to keep the Federal Government inspectors from arbitrarily going in and looking over their records and causing unnecessary trouble. But here 85 percent of the pharmacists keep records today throughout the country—that is the testimony—and make them available to the inspectors when they come in. The others keep records, if they are legitimate in their business. They have to keep records because there are prescription medicines involved. They can keep those records or they can keep separate records under this bill, just so they keep accurate records, subject to inspection. We do not find that this is any great burden or any great imposition, in view of the difficult situation that faces the Nation today. I feel that all people who are involved in the distribution of these drugs ought to willingly and gladly accept these requirements in order that we can meet the problem and cut it back as it should be.

What about the man who goes into the basement of a house somewhere and sets himself up a manufacturing plant and starts in business, which is what the rec-

ord shows happens? Why should we not have the machinery to have the people responsible for the administration of this program go in and dig out that kind of activity, and not permit them to continually prey upon the American people, our youth, our school-age children, those of our adults who become addicts, and those who abuse this privilege in our society? We get to that problem by this method.

Members may want to know how much this is going to cost. We do not know for sure, but it is estimated that it will probably cost about \$10 million a year. If the Food and Drug Administration gets the people that they think they should have, which would be probably in the neighborhood of 500, there would be 400 inspectors or agents who would be dispersed throughout the United States for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this law. It is estimated that approximately 100 people would be required to carry on the other activities in the administration of the bill. Those and the 400 who would be charged as investigators or inspectors would cost the taxpayers about \$10 million a year. If it requires that, I think it would be worth it. I think it would be something well spent with the thousands or millions of people that we might and very well could, as we go on through the years, save from human suffering because of illegal, illicit, and counterfeiting activity in this country.

Another problem that came to the committee's attention during its investigation with this bill was the problem of drug counterfeiting. This is an immensely profitable business and one involving very serious hazards to the public health. Barbiturates and amphetamines are counterfeited as are other drugs.

A counterfeit drug, like counterfeit money, is a fraud on the public. More important, however, is the imminent danger which it presents to the health of the user. Enormous profits can be made by counterfeiting legitimate drugs with minimal risks of penalties under the present law. For this reason, the activity has become widespread and sometimes is nationwide in scope.

The counterfeit drug is not manufactured under the controls or with the care that is taken for the legitimate drug it imitates, and there is no guarantee that the counterfeit drug contains the amounts, quality, and kinds of ingredients the legitimate drug contains. A consumer who is sold a counterfeit drug may have his health and even his life dependent on a product which has little or no resemblance to the drug prescribed by his physician, except for labeling or appearance. In turn, his physician may be misled in his intended therapeutic regimen by the different response of the patient to the drug from that anticipated.

Production and distribution of counterfeit drugs are bootleg operations. Special equipment for their production such as tableting dyes, tableting punches, and capsule marking machines are secreted and put to use surreptitiously.

After being produced under conditions designedly hidden from inspection by

Federal, State, and local officials, counterfeit drugs are distributed by equally devious means. These have included shipment in unmarked cartons and containers. No matter the route, however, the ultimate consumer receives a counterfeit drug in place of a trustworthy medicine. He is defrauded, and his health is jeopardized.

Because of the clandestine methods by which counterfeit drugs are manufactured and distributed and the burden they impose on interstate commerce in legitimate drugs, their regulation as contemplated by this bill, whether they are in interstate commerce or not, is absolutely essential to the effective protection of the public health.

Now, let me speak about another provision and then I will yield the floor, Mr. Chairman. I apologize for taking so much time, but there is a lot in this. Our committee has determined to make a record, and we are going to make a complete record here. I compliment the entire committee for the attention and the study and the thoughtfulness and the careful approach they gave to this problem. This bill comes to you by unanimous vote of the committee.

Someone said, How about letting the States do it? Why do we not let the States do this? We do not interfere with any activity of any State. Some States have provisions of law to meet the problem and are doing a fairly good job, but I must say to you with candor that there are many of our States that have little or no law to deal effectively with this problem.

I will offer an amendment to meet a suggestion made by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, in order to make it certain that we do just what we intend to do. That is the position which will save the States' responsibility.

Also, Mr. Chairman, some concern has been expressed about the confidentiality of information obtained by Food and Drug inspectors. I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a letter I have from the Food and Drug Administration:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D.C., March 5, 1965.

HON. OREN HARRIS,  
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This responds to your request for a statement of the safeguards which would be employed by the Food and Drug Administration in case H.R. 2 becomes law, to avoid unauthorized disclosure by Food and Drug employees of information obtained during review of prescription files.

The Food and Drug Administration has published section 4.1, title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, which prohibits an employee of the Food and Drug Administration from making unauthorized disclosures of any information acquired in the discharge of his official duties. Information obtained during inspection of prescription files or any other files would be protected by this regulation. Failure of an employee to observe the provisions of the regulation would be considered as grounds for dismissal.

The FDA requires each new inspector to undergo a period of training before he is allowed to operate alone. The training man-

ual for new inspectors cautions him to observe a strict code of ethics and provides that the trainee shall be informed of his obligations under the regulations regarding the disclosure of official records and information (referred to in the preceding paragraph).

Each inspector of the Food and Drug Administration is supplied with his own copy of an inspector's manual. This contains a copy of section 4.1, title 21, Code of Federal Regulations. In addition it contains the following precautionary statement in the section relating to establishment inspections (inspection of the prescription files of a drugstore would be a type of establishment inspection):

"Bear in mind that casual and seemingly innocuous statements or questions during establishment inspections may reveal privileged information. Be constantly alert to avoid divulging any information, which through misrepresentation, might in any way compromise your integrity and the confidence enjoyed by the Administration."

Moreover, while section 1905, title 18 of the United States Code is not entirely clear on this point it may make such disclosure a criminal offense.

It is our conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that inspectors of the FDA are thoroughly trained in the necessity of observing the utmost discretion in the pursuit of their duties and of scrupulously protecting all information which they obtain in the course of those duties. If H.R. 2 is enacted with provision for audit of prescription files, we would, in order to further emphasize the safeguards that must be observed by inspectors, specifically caution both in the training manual for new inspectors and in the inspector's manual for all inspectors against the unauthorized disclosure of any information obtained in connection with review of prescription files.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. HARVEY,  
Deputy Commissioner.

Some concern has also been expressed about the procedures under part of the bill relating to exemptions. I am inserting at this point in the RECORD an exchange of letters between myself and the department:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., March 2, 1965.

HON. GEORGE P. LARRICK,  
Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LARRICK: In the recently concluded hearings on H.R. 2, the Food and Drug Administration expressed a preference that the provisions covering exemptions for all over-the-counter drugs and for various combination products remain in the form contained in H.R. 2 as introduced rather than be incorporated into the definitional sections of the act as proposed by the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association. We understand from the FDA staff memorandum submitted on February 10, 1965, that the basis for your position is not any different with the conclusion that these products should be exempted from the act, but your judgment that to incorporate the exemptions in the definitions would burden the Government with the requirement of proving, in each court case, that the product in question was neither a nonprescription drug nor an exempted combination product.

The committee would appreciate learning what procedures the Food and Drug Administration will follow to implement the exemptions called for by the proposed section 511(e)(2) and the length of time it will take to place such exemptions into effect. We hope that such procedures will be streamlined and expeditious so that the companies

and persons subject to the legislation will not be burdened with needless uncertainty.

It would be most helpful if we could have your views promptly.

Sincerely yours,

OREN HARRIS,  
Chairman.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION AND WELFARE,  
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D.C., March 5, 1965.

HON. OREN HARRIS,  
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This replies to your letter of March 2, 1965, with reference to H.R. 2, asking what procedures the Food and Drug Administration will follow to implement the exemptions called for by the proposed section 511(e)(2) of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and the length of time it will take to place such exemptions in effect.

If the bill becomes law we would study our records to determine what drugs should be exempted from coverage. We would publish a proposal in the Federal Register to exempt these drugs and would invite comment on the proposal. After studying any comments received we would then publish an order exempting those drugs that, in view of all available evidence, warranted such action. Additionally, the drug industry could suggest products that it believed should be exempted and furnish supporting evidence. In the manner described above we would publish a list of these products, seek comment on it and issue an exempting order covering all drugs on the proposed list that warranted exemption.

In the event of controversy involving a drug proposed for exemption we probably would seek the advice of an advisory committee formed in accordance with the procedures set forth in H.R. 2.

We would expect to have the exemption in effect for drugs initially considered and not in controversy by the time the statute became fully effective. In the case of drugs about which a difference of scientific opinion developed, more time probably would be required. Certainly we share the committee's desire to resolve uncertainties insofar as possible by prompt action.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. HARVEY,  
Deputy Commissioner.

It is the purpose and intent of this legislation to cooperate with the States insofar as it is possible to do so in the administration of this far-reaching and important proposal.

In my judgment, with the Federal Government working arm in arm with our States toward the solution of this problem, we can meet it and we will meet it. We will see a vast improvement among our fellow Americans so that they may be permitted to enjoy the blessings of life that we, as Americans, have today in our society.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas has consumed 55 minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, screaming headlines across the Nation shout forth the horrifying story of drug abuse in words like these: "Goofballed Youths Kick Old Man to Death in Park," "Driver in Fatal Truck Crash Pep Pill User," "Holdup Killing Laid to Desperate Addicts."

These and many others like them tell the story day after day of the terrible

social toll being exacted by misuse of a series of drugs which, when used under a doctor's prescription in normal doses, have proved to be a real boon to mankind. What are these substances with so much potential for good and so much demonstrated danger of abuse as to become a national scandal? Medically, they are known as barbiturates and amphetamines. In the back-alley trade and among those who use them for kicks, until their systems demand more and more, they are known as "goofballs" and "pep pills." There are other names for specific types or brands, such as "Blue Haven," "Benny," "Yellow Jackets," and "Red Birds."

When administered by a doctor, barbiturates will help a patient sleep or remove tensions which aggravate serious ills. They have been known for many years for their many advantages over the so-called hard drugs, such as morphine and heroin, both of which may cause addiction in the patient, even though taken only to relieve unbearable pain. Amphetamines are stimulants which work also on the central nervous system, but for opposite results. They help a patient stay awake, stay alert, and rise above smothering morbidity. Used with care and under doctor's orders, neither of these substances will cause addiction. Taken in large, nonmedical doses, however, they produce unpredictable and bizarre results. The user may become intoxicated for a relatively short period of time. He may do things which are entirely foreign to his ordinary pattern of behavior. In common language, they can drive him right off his rocker and no one can tell what he might do—least of all him.

Once the user has become addicted, and many do, the pills become a necessity, not a thrill. The effects on the body resemble the massive overuse of alcohol as personality disintegrates and the person loses his grip on his life. There is no road back for the confirmed addict. Society has lost a productive citizen and all his potential.

How could substances known to be dangerous get such a head start on the law? How could the traffic grow? How did it get from a few kicks for college students and other youth to highway crashes, assorted crimes of violence, and degrading addiction? Well, for one thing, these pills are easy to peddle, easy to take, not very expensive, and even relatively easy to make. This all adds up to a growing traffic. And, perhaps I should add, the traffic is profitable. When these things combine you can be sure that the underworld will soon discover it and take over or it will create a new underworld of its own.

Let us consider the possibilities behind a typical headline: "Local Youth Found Dead of Drugs." Chances are the drugs were barbiturates or amphetamines. Did he die a suicide or did he misjudge the dosage he chose without medical advice? Was he using a drug compounded by a competent manufacturer or did he get a crude counterfeit processed with no thought to safety? And how did those pills, intended for carefully supervised use, get into the pocket of the dead boy?

Who put that pill in his pocket anyhow? Was it the venal, ignorant peddler who would sell his mother for 50 cents? Not alone it was not. The blame can be shared by many people and by all of the echelons of the drug distribution system. Let me tell you a few true stories to illustrate in what ways they helped this tragedy to occur.

In an attempt to show how easy a crook could get his hands on "goof balls" and "pep pills," a man named McMullen, with Columbia Broadcasting Co., set himself up as "McMullen Associates" in New York. Now, he did not have the required registration number from the Food and Drug Administration. He did not really proclaim to be a real wholesaler of drugs. But he got a letterhead and ordered large shipments of these things from many of the drug manufacturing companies across the country. Did they bounce back and say, "All right, chum, let us see your registration before we ship you this order"? Well, half of them did. All of them should have. The half that paid no attention shipped McMullen a total of 1,075,000 doses of barbiturates and amphetamines before anyone tipped off the New York authorities and they moved in. He bought this hoard for \$675. On the illicit pill market it would have brought a price of one-quarter to one-half million dollars. This story had a happy ending because McMullen was doing a public service. He helped show how loose the controls really are at the manufacturing level.

Not all stories have this happy ending. The files of the Food and Drug Administration reveal the case of one William L. Palmer, Jr., whose only ambition was to "buy 'em cheap and sell 'em dear." Listen to what he was able to buy without any trouble.

First. From a Detroit, Mich., firm: 8 million amphetamine tablets over a 9-month period in 1962 and 1963.

Second. From a small manufacturer in Union City, N.J.: over a half million amphetamine tablets between December 1961 and September 1962.

Third. From a manufacturing firm in Greenville, N.C.: over 2 million tablets.

Fourth. From two firms, one in Illinois and one in Philadelphia, over 3 million tablets.

Although most large and respected names in the drug manufacturing industry have controls which make it harder to be fooled, they still must be fooled at times. It is estimated that out of 9½ billion doses of these drugs made up last year 4½ billion went into illicit channels. Now, something has been mighty wrong about controls when half of the national production flows freely through illegal hands to further crime and to wreck lives.

Firms which manufacture drugs sell directly to hospitals, to pharmacies and to doctors, but a large part of the production is distributed through wholesalers. These firms have been responsible for a great deal of the leakage also. In 1963 the FDA was investigating the activities of a suspected drug peddler named Paul Anness, of Covington, Ky. They found that one of his sources of supply was the Cincinnati Economy Drug Co. Follow-up investigation revealed that, unknown

to the management, several hundred thousand amphetamine tablets and some barbiturates had been stolen in a short period. Poor security and faulty record-keeping let this happen. Study of the many cases which came before the committee shows clearly that many wholesalers operate on good intentions and sloppy methods. One who keeps complete and accurate records will not be burdened by the requirements of the Drug Act Amendments of 1965. If he comes bellyaching that this is a burden on him it can only mean that he is unwilling to assume any of the responsibility for plugging this wide hole. He, I fear, does not have either the character or the civic conscience necessary to be in this business.

Have we now covered all the outlets for illegal drugs? Is it possible that some may trickle out through the retail drug store? I am afraid it is more than possible. It is happening. How? Well, you think of a way it might happen and you will be right. Some druggists fall for the easy money and are willing to jeopardize their professional standing and cast a pall over the whole necessary and excellent system of retail drug stores. Some keep poor records. Some are victimized by employees who outright rob them or buy large shipments in their names and then intercept them before delivery.

A few transgressors always bring regulation to the honest in their ranks. If it were an infinitesimal amount perhaps the few should merely be dealt with individually. Maybe no additional safeguards are needed. I wish I could agree that this were so. Unfortunately, violations among druggists have amounted to 1,100 cases. You can see from the story so far that millions of tablets could have, and probably did, go wrong this way. In my view there would be no use in dealing with most of the problem and ignoring the last 25 percent. That would be foolish and less than honest. It would not be doing the job you have the right to expect. So, at the risk of incurring the wrath of some of my friends in the retail drug business I found it necessary to propose and support the parts of the recent act which will require some recordkeeping by and inspection of drug stores.

All this leaves only one possible source of barbiturates and amphetamines in the legitimate chain of distribution—the doctor. Today few doctors sell drugs outright, but a few still do. They must comply with the new law. This does not mean that the occasional administration of these drugs by a physician will make him subject to the law. It does, however, require that all prescriptions for such drugs be limited to 6 months. A personable young doctor with the Oklahoma Department of Health appeared before the committee and told us of his undercover study of this problem in Oklahoma City. He found every source of drugs we have discussed here so far. But he found also that many addicts were started off or kept going by "open end" prescriptions. Although not intended to feed a habit when written, these prescriptions were filled without question

indefinitely. It was on this basis that the 6-month restriction was decided upon.

By now you must be surprised that the curse of drug abuse with barbiturates and amphetamines is not even worse than we find it. But now I must tell you that there is another source of this stuff. It was hinted at earlier, but you no doubt have noticed how careful I have been to refer to the "legal" channels of distribution. How about illegal channels? What are they? Let me tell you what I learned for the first time. I had heard of counterfeit money, but never of counterfeit drugs. It seems that barbiturates and amphetamines are reasonably easy to make from basic material, which is, or has been, fairly easy to obtain. In basements, in attics, and behind false stairways small chemical compounding shops flourish. They make a "goof ball" which looks just like a tablet made by your own favorite drug firm. They even make the bottle to look the same. In a small space hundreds of thousands can be produced. Intended only for the "thrill" market, they can eliminate several steps in getting the pill to the ultimate user. The profits are astronomical. The purity of the product is of no great concern. Such activity, perhaps the most vicious of all, and always illegal, must be made more hazardous. Hopefully, it will be halted.

Now that I have directed your attention to so much that is wrong, let me brighten the picture by disclosing something that I think is right—the Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965, also known as H.R. 5592. You will see that my bill tackles each of the problems posed by this situation and advances what I believe to be a logical and workable solution. The Food and Drug Administration, the pharmaceutical manufacturers, and the American Medical Association think so too. Naturally each of our witnesses would like slight changes in one part or another, but none deny the efficacy of the steps being taken to stop the leaks. Without reverting to dry, legislative language, let me outline what this important new act does.

From now on manufacturers must keep complete records of their production of barbiturates and amphetamines and also their sales. It will be easier, if not simple, to look at these records and tell whether certain pharmacies, hospitals, or other outlets are buying unrealistically large numbers of these drugs. Such records must be open to inspection by the Federal Government, because the problem cannot possibly be contained within the bounds of any State. It is obviously a national problem, which will respond only to treatment on a national scale.

Wholesalers must also keep records of inventories, purchases, and sales. These will be open to inspection. The very requirement should tighten up the procedures which at this level of distribution have been responsible for so much slippage. It was suggested at one point that they compile this information and report periodically to the Food and Drug Administration. A close look at this idea indicated to me that it would go beyond the necessities of good law and become an economic boobytrap to those in the

business. It would unduly harass the citizen, but not contribute much to enforcement. The idea was discarded.

Your retail druggist must keep information on hand to show what he gets and what he sells. No special forms or additional bookkeeping are expected. Commonsense tells us that with dangerous drugs on his shelves he should know what he buys, what he sells, and what is left. If he can do that, the likelihood of his becoming an unknown tool of the underworld traffic is very slight. He should sleep better when he knows for sure. And with no prescription for barbiturates or amphetamines good for over 6 months, he need not wonder about the customer who returns early and often for a new supply.

By reciting these desirable changes in the law we can almost convince ourselves that we have licked the problem. But we know better when we think about it. Nothing stops the outright criminal bent upon furthering a vicious and profitable trade. Broken lives mean nothing to him. Life itself means little as long as it is someone else's life. We have plugged the big holes in the dike. The criminal, whether he be a shady character with a pocketful of degradation for sale at so much a pill, or business or professional man who has succumbed to the lure of dollars over pride and conscience, we can combat on equal terms. We can combat him, that is, with the tools to be provided by this legislation and some increase in the manpower responsible for enforcement.

With the revelation of the extent and growth of drug abuse and the social devastation which accompanies it, there was every reason to provide stiff penalties for violation of these minimal and sensible requirements. This is a criminal statute. The violator stands to have drugs seized, equipment confiscated, and also be subject to fines and imprisonment. But most particularly it seemed to me we needed to make it most hazardous to put these pills in the hands of our young folk. For that reason, my bill provides for a fine of \$5,000 and up to 2 years in prison for anyone over 18 years old selling to one under 18. The second time he can get 6 years and pay up to \$15,000. In the scheme of Federal criminal law these are pretty stiff penalties. In view of the fabulous amounts of money to be made by these vultures, it could be argued that they are too small.

I predict that these changes in the law will successfully limit the misuse of barbiturates and amphetamines. But we all know that criminals are resourceful. If they cannot make a fast buck on barbiturates they will search, and find, a substitute. Maybe not quite as powerful or satisfactory to their purpose, but salable. It is much like squeezing a balloon. It pops out somewhere else almost at once. There are other chemicals, such as tranquilizers, which may very likely be the logical substitutes and there will be more discovered as time goes on. What can we do to prevent a whole new cycle of events we have examined here? The bill recognizes this reality by giving to the Food and Drug Administration the authority to look into other drugs which

might become subject to abuse in the stead of barbiturates and amphetamines. Subject to administrative safeguards, it can decide to include them and thereby make them subject to the same controls. It should provide the backstop we need.

As I said earlier, there is no single villain in the piece. Less than full enforcement of laws already in effect puts a fair share of blame on government. This was accompanied by far less than enthusiastic efforts by the people in the chain of distribution. The mere statistic that half of all the production was going into illicit channels should have alerted, in fact it should have alarmed, legitimate dealers long ago. But it takes the determined effort, intended by this act, to put the spotlight on the evil and to jolt everyone into realization and action. I am proud of my connection with this bill. My sponsorship coincides with efforts by other members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce who helped to make a complete and lucid record in our hearings. One tries to avoid breaking his arm patting himself on the back and taking undue credit for doing the job he was elected to do. It is right and proper, however, to share with you this landmark achievement of Congress in which he furnished some leadership.

Honest manufacturers, honest wholesalers, honest retail druggists, and doctors almost without exception should, and no doubt will, cooperate fully. By the grace of God and the determined effort of those charged with responsibility under this act, the lives of many of our citizens, particularly many of our young people, upon whom the future depends, will be spared from the personal ravages and the wreckage of drug abuse.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. YOUNGER].

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this is a good bill for the purpose for which it was reported; that is, the possible curtailment of the flow of stimulant, depressant, barbiturate, and amphetamine pills which are habitforming. Now, I am not naive enough to tell this committee or to imply that this bill is going to stop the illicit trade in this business. You cannot stop illicit trade in a business of this kind where there is as much money involved as there is in this particular trade. To give you some idea of what is involved, the dealers in this business can buy 1,000 pills for 75 cents. The retail price of those pills is \$125 a thousand; so you can imagine the immense amount of money involved and the profit that is involved in this kind of a trade.

As the chairman has stated, last year there were some 9½ billion doses manufactured in this country of which almost one-half went into the illicit business, and could be so traced. That was because we do not have the machinery at the present time to trace where these pills go. We do have at the present time a law which makes it mandatory that the manufacturer be listed with the Pure Food and Drug Administration. But beyond that there is no control. The manufacturer has to keep an inventory

and a record of to whom he sells and he is supposed to sell only to an authorized purchaser.

But the testimony, as you can read in the hearings, was that the man who was not an authorized purchaser had no trouble at all in purchasing something like 1 million doses of these pills.

We are adding the wholesaler. He must register with the Food and Drug Administration and must keep records to whom he sells and of his inventory. So that if any one person seems to be buying an inordinate amount of these pills the Pure Food and Drug Administration can find out the person to whom these pills are going and in that way find the guilty person.

There are other parties who are legitimate buyers, as pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois, and I shall not repeat them. I do want to mention, however, the other six drugs which the chairman referred to. I do not want even to attempt to mention their names because I cannot pronounce them, but I will say to you that they are all listed on page 13 of the committee report at paragraph 3. These particular drugs, six of them, were all listed by the President's Advisory Commission on Narcotics and Drug Abuse. They were also listed by Dr. Carl F. Essig of the National Institute of Mental Health Addiction Research Center in Lexington, Ky. To show you the extent to which these pills are manufactured, there is one pill, Librium, which is a new pill that has been on the market for only a short time; and yet in 1964 the amount in money of those pills manufactured was \$53,932,000.

Personally I wanted to see these six drugs mentioned in the bill. I introduced an amendment to that effect but the committee did not see fit to include them. But they are included in our instructions to the Food and Drug Administration and they are well covered in the report.

I am sure that the Food and Drug Administration—and Mr. Larrick in his testimony gave us the impression—that within 6 months he will hold the hearings, and if these drugs are found to be depressants or stimulants and habit forming, they would be included. I am sure that Mr. Larrick will carry that out.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I would be glad to yield to our chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. I believe it would be well to point out further that the committee felt it would be advisable—and we had medical testimony to this effect and technical advice from the Food and Drug Administration and others—in order to meet the problem as it should be met for administrative purposes, we should stay within classes of drugs; in other words, barbiturates are a class to which we refer here. There are many derivatives included in this class, however, and likewise with amphetamines.

The drugs just mentioned by the gentleman from California in which he did express a great deal of interest during the course of our hearings—and the committee consideration of this pro-

gram—are individual drugs. We felt that if we started taking individual drugs into consideration we would miss a great many of them and possibly some important ones, or there would be others of similar character which would be developed. Consequently, in order to accomplish what the gentleman had in mind, and appropriately so we thought, we did include in the report reference to these drugs. I believe it would be well to read, if the gentleman will indulge me—

Mr. YOUNGER. I would be glad to, sir.

Mr. HARRIS. I believe it would be well to read these into the RECORD because not everyone who reads this RECORD may have an opportunity to see the report. Therefore, I believe it would be appropriate to read this into the RECORD in order that it might be made available and more widely distributed. This language appears at page 13 of the report, beginning in the next to the last paragraph of section 3:

The committee considered the advisability of specifically designating meprobamate, glutethimide, ethinamate, ethchlorvynol, methyprylon, and chlordiazepoxide as "depressant or stimulant drugs." It was decided that this should not be done because the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will, under the provisions of proposed section 201(v)(3) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, consider designing these drugs as "depressant or stimulant drugs" and that it would be inadvisable to single out these drugs while leaving out others having substantially similar abuse potentials. The committee expects the Secretary to take early action with respect to the consideration of the listing of these six drugs.

Now, that is what the committee report says. I believe that is what the Secretary will do. I believe that within 6 months they will be considered and we will still stay within the principle of making this legislation applicable to classes of drugs in order that there might be a more effective administration of the legislation.

Mr. YOUNGER. I thank the chairman, and I want to congratulate him for treading where angels fear to tread in attempting to pronounce those unpronounceable names of the drugs which we refer to all the time as the "six drugs." I have no doubt but what the Commissioner will do exactly what he told the committee he would do, and for one, I believe that we will see to it later on that he does do exactly what he has promised, and if he needs any prodding the committee will do that.

I just want to mention one other phase of this bill because I am particularly interested in including physicians in recordkeeping, provided they are doing what really amounts to an illicit business. I know when we close all of the other avenues for these pills because of the immense amount of money involved there will be the possibility of some unethical licensed practitioner who will want to set up an office out here somewhere and deal in these pills, and will do so, because there is no question about him being able to buy them. He can legally buy any quantity he wants to, and in 1 year or in 6 months,

before they can catch up with him, he could make more profit than he could possibly make in the legitimate practice of medicine the rest of his life.

So, in order to stop that, and in order to make another cause of action against such a person, we did include physicians who are of that character. We have no intention whatsoever that the practitioner who merely disperses a pill or two once in a while on his rounds of patients should be included. As a matter of fact, licensed practitioners, if they are smart enough and I know they are, should come within this law so they can give these pills to what few patients need them and be absolutely clear of the law.

One other thought: We here appropriate a lot of money in regard to the cost of the administration of this Government. I am not one of the last big spenders in the Congress, but I do back this bill, and I want to see it administered properly. I want to say that the cost of administering this bill properly will yield greater returns to the health of our people and to the welfare of our country than probably any other appropriation this Congress will be called upon to make.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I want to congratulate the gentleman from California, as well as the gentleman from Illinois who spoke previously, on their lucid explanation of this important legislation. Further, I congratulate the entire committee for coming to grips with this very important and pressing problem. I think, coming particularly as it does on the heels of the Presidential message on law enforcement and drawing of the Nation to crime as an important problem, this is a very heartening display of congressional initiative in linking this problem to juvenile delinquency.

I have one question I would like to direct to the gentleman from California. He mentioned, and I hope I have the figures correctly, a dealer could purchase a thousand doses of barbiturates or amphetamines for 75 cents, and the retail price would be \$125.

Is that the illicit price?

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Rather than the normal, legitimate price?

Mr. YOUNGER. That is the retail price in the illicit market, \$125 a thousand.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGER. I might add, you will note in the message yesterday from the President he mentioned the very same drugs covered by this bill, so that our committee was the first committee this session to beat the President to reporting a bill before the President sent a message to Congress requesting this legislation.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN].

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak in support of this measure. Our committee held exhaustive hearings, probing all aspects of this measure, and definite need for legislation seemed obvious.

It was interesting to note that no reputable, responsible drug manufacturer opposed legislation dealing with the problem we are considering, but there did appear to be some areas that needed immediate attention that seemingly by the language of the bill escaped immediate attention.

Mr. George Larrick, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, appeared before the committee and his statement was a most interesting one, but it would appear to me that in view of his testimony there is something to be desired in H.R. 2.

H.R. 2 deals with depressant and stimulant drugs, and the measure specifically names barbiturates and amphetamines. However, testimony submitted by Mr. Larrick indicated other drugs of equally dangerous characteristics. I refer to Mr. Larrick's comments on page 3 of his statement:

While we have been discussing barbiturates and amphetamines almost exclusively, it is important to point out that this bill is aimed also at other types of drugs capable of causing similar or related ill effects and there are a number of such drugs already known to be misused to some extent. For example, you may recall rather extensive publicity of a few years ago about serious abuses that have developed around some of our larger educational and research institutions from experimentation with drugs which produced hallucinations and other mental aberrations when administered in minute doses. One of these is a chemical commonly referred to as LSD-25 (its chemical name is *d*-lysergic acid diethylamide tartrate). In addition to producing the immediate hallucinations and aberrations which the experiments sought, this drug has been found capable of inducing lasting changes in the mental and emotional stability of some users; and, there are instances in which college students who took doses of the drug for thrills or for nonscientific experimentation became disturbed to the point that they had to leave college or even enter mental institutions. The drug also produces strong suicidal tendencies in some victims.

Mr. Larrick further stated:

Tranquilizers are being increasingly implicated by medical evidence as agents of drug abuse. In an article appearing in the August 10, 1963, issue of the *Journal of the American Medical Association*, members of the Public Health Service's National Clearinghouse for Poison Control Centers reported on 968 cases of tranquilizer ingestions occurring from July 1959 through December 1960. In conclusion, the authors stated: "Intentional ingestion was known to be the etiological basis in 35 percent of the cases reviewed. It becomes evident that the popularity of tranquilizers as suicidal agents must now rival that of the barbiturates."

Also on page 4 of his statement, Mr. Larrick refers to a study conducted at the Boston City Hospital, Boston, Mass., stating that "from October 1961 to May 1962, a total of 82 drug abusers and addicts was reported. Of the 82, 44 were addicted to narcotics, 24 were abusers of barbiturates and amphetamines, 10

abused tranquilizers, and 2 each abused bromides and inhalers. Authorities in the field, including Dr. Hamburger, have taken the position that many of the tranquilizers are very close to the barbiturates in their effects, although not in chemical structure. Tranquilizers, like barbiturates, can cause tolerance and psychic and physical dependence. The addicting properties of meprobamate have been rather extensively reported in the literature, and this literature clearly shows that this drug and certain others of the so-called tranquilizers are subject to abuse."

During the hearings on H.R. 2, reference was made to a document by Dr. Carl F. Essig. Dr. Essig, of Lexington, Ky., is associated with the National Institute of Mental Health, Addiction Research Center, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Quoting in part from this document, the following statement appears:

Increasing numbers of nonbarbiturate sedative drugs are being introduced into medical practice. Despite their nonbarbiturate chemical structure and regardless of designations other than "sedative-hypnotic," at least six of the newer depressant drugs can cause states of intoxication and physical dependence that are clinically similar to those induced by barbiturates. These drugs are meprobamate (Miltown, Equanil), glutethimide (Doriden), ethinamate (Valmid), ethchlorvynol (Placidyl), methypyrion (Noludar) and chlorthalidoxepine (Librium). The behavioral effects of these drugs and their combination with ethanol may become an increasingly important public hazard. The abstinence syndromes that can result from the abrupt withdrawal of excess dosages of these drugs include convulsions and psychotic behavior. Death has been attributed to withdrawal of meprobamate and methypyrion.

The bill provides that the barbiturates will immediately be subject to the new controls, but the nonbarbiturates will not be brought under the controls until the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare holds hearings and issues regulations, which of course will take time.

The committee report states that the committee expects the Secretary to take early action with respect to the consideration of the listing of these six drugs. I should like to emphasize this statement and urge the Secretary to move promptly in his consideration of bringing these drugs under the control of the bill. Any delay in action will be detrimental to the public interest in seeing that all depressant drugs which have a significant potential for abuse are promptly brought under the new controls. In addition to this, it would also result in some unfair competitive advantages within the drug industry itself.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] such time as he may consume.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to lend my support to H.R. 2 which would control the distribution of depressant and stimulant drugs. I do not believe there can be any serious dispute on the nature of the problem which led to the legislative proposals before us today, and I want to congratulate the committee for bringing this bill to the floor.

Testimony before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee indicated that over 9 billion depressant and stimulant pills are produced each year and over half of these find their way into the black market.

In fact, the ridiculous ease with which anyone may obtain large quantities of these dangerous drugs was made abundantly clear by a recent nationwide television program. The producer of the program set up a bogus company and with an outlay of only \$600, was able to obtain over 1 million pills which could be sold on the black market for more than \$250,000.

What are the consequences of this vast and profitable trade in illicit drugs? Many people, and particularly teenagers, who take these drugs for so-called "kicks" have developed a dangerous dependence upon them. A special ad hoc Panel on Drug Abuse appointed in 1963 by President Kennedy concluded that there is an entirely new and increasing use of these drugs among teenagers. The increase in these drugs, commonly referred to as "pep pills" or "goof balls," has been accompanied by a decline in the use of narcotics, presumably because such pills are far easier to obtain.

The senior Senator from Connecticut, who is chairman of a Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency which investigated this problem, stated that these drugs cause people to commit serious crimes and that they are increasingly used by children who formerly were not delinquent.

The Attorney General of California has claimed that there is a new and growing problem associated with these drugs and that a whole new class of addicts is being created. He cites figures which show that the number of arrests for dangerous drug offenses climbed 31 percent throughout the State in 1 year.

The executive director of the New York City Youth Board has reported that 25 percent of the children studied by his agency are involved in the use of drugs ranging from narcotics to barbiturates.

Even while hearings on this bill were being conducted, three Chicago youths, hopped up on goof balls, murdered a helpless old man solely to obtain his pocket change. He had a mere \$11 in his pocket. "We were hopped up," said one of the youths in explanation.

Mr. Speaker, we are clearly faced with a serious national problem of growing proportions. Although we have very stiff laws to control the use of hard core narcotics, Federal authorities are virtually helpless to cope with the growing misuse of barbiturates and similar drugs. We are merely substituting one form of addiction for another.

I therefore support the sound and reasonable approach to this problem embodied in H.R. 2 as reported out by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The bill would end the illegal traffic in these dangerous drugs by prohibiting their possession to anyone not in the legitimate chain of distribution. Manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers would be required to keep records so that all shipments can be traced. And

finally, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would be given adequate enforcement powers to prevent the illegal distribution of these drugs.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the work of the distinguished Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and its able chairman. They have produced a balanced and reasonable recommendation on a problem of vital national significance. I urge all Members to join with me in voting for this important piece of legislation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, with the indulgence of the gentleman from California, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONER] such time as he may require for a question.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this time to rise in support of this legislation and commend the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], and, indeed, every other member of the committee, for bringing the Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965 to the House for consideration.

The question I would like to ask the chairman of the full committee is simply this: Is it the purpose of the legislation to be sure that the illegal traffic in these drugs is reduced to a minimum rather than to punish some individual drug user?

Mr. HARRIS. I will say to the gentleman in response that I have tried diligently today to emphasize and stress the fact that the purpose of this legislation is to do something about the illicit traffic in order to lessen the illegal distribution of the drugs. There is no intention on the part of the committee to impose the strong arm of the Federal Government on any legitimate activity. Also, there is no intention that the bill cover the individual user of the drug.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I say again this is good legislation and I hope the House will adopt it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana has consumed 2 minutes.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, let me first of all congratulate the chairman and members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the very rational and logical treatment of the critical and difficult subject covered in the Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965.

I am sure that the ability to recognize the drug abuse problem in its proper perspective and to come forward with legislation aimed at correcting these abuses has been aided by many agencies and interests. I am proud to observe that Abbott Laboratories, one of the outstanding drug manufacturers and also noted for its outstanding research and development of useful pharmaceuticals, is included among those who are supporting this legislation. Abbott Laboratories developed several well-recognized barbiturates and amphetamines, including Nembutal, Desoxyn and Desbutal. These drugs are highly regarded in the world of medicine and serve vital functions in the treatment of human disease.

However, Abbott Laboratories recognized that these drugs are not safe for use except under the supervision of a physician. They recognize the need for control in order to promote the legitimate medical uses for which these drugs are intended and to avoid the improper and degrading use of these and other drugs.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note in this legislation that the committee has recognized the evil involved in counterfeit drugs and that in subsection (c) which amends section 301 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act there is a prohibition against "making, selling, disposing of or keeping in possession, control or custody or concealing anything designed to reproduce the identifying mark of another or any likeness thereof so as to render such drug a counterfeit drug," and also a prohibition against the sale of counterfeit drugs.

My familiarity with Abbott Laboratories has convinced me that this organization takes particular pride in establishing a high quality of purity and strict control. The uniformity of these drug products is maintained so that physician and patient can be absolutely certain when use of such drugs is prescribed. Of course, the counterfeiters of such drugs could not possibly provide the safeguards which Abbotts and other reputable manufacturers maintain. Accordingly, it is most important for the protection of the public, the medical profession and the manufacturers themselves that these appropriate steps against counterfeit drugs should be included.

Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], ranking minority member on this committee, as well as the other members of the committee for bringing forth this sound and much-needed legislation. I am confident that the results flowing from this measure will be salutary and that the continued appropriate use of these drugs may continue while abuses in the manufacturing, trafficking, and taking of such drugs will be abated.

Mr. Chairman, I urge favorable action on H.R. 2.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALPERN. I am glad to yield to my distinguished colleague from New York.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to go on record as strongly supporting H.R. 2, legislation on drug control. I want also to commend the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for its diligent work on this serious national problem.

There are urgent reasons which argue for passage of this measure. Drug abuse goes beyond the limits of a single problem. What may begin as an isolated incident in narcotics abuse, for example, may very well end in violent

crime, in juvenile delinquency, in the destruction of family life, and the attempt to break the cycle of poverty. This is the insidious nature of the narcotics problem. It takes advantage of other social disorders; and it exploits them and contributes to their spread.

Perhaps the most frustrating side of narcotics abuse is its effect on innocent or vulnerable people—often young people. We are by now all too well familiar with the narcotics case which began "because there was nothing else to do" or "because I wanted some kicks and the stuff was around." The great issue in narcotics abuse is the overavailability and illegal distribution of dangerous drugs. For this is how many people who become victims become initially hooked. And this is the area where sympathetic but firm Federal action can help reduce the tragic national narcotics problem.

The legislation before the House is the end product of a long process of consultation and consideration which began with President Kennedy's Advisory Commission on Narcotic and Drug Abuse and was continued in President Johnson's instructive message to Congress, "Advancing the Nation's Health."

Experts well acquainted with the drug abuse have strongly urged the Congress to pass measures providing for increased control over the distribution of dangerous drugs. This would be accomplished through a careful delineation of those channels where drug traffic is legal, for careful control of interstate drug movements, through rigorous inspection requirements and detailed record-keeping.

These measures, we are told, are all the more necessary given the apparent inadequacy of voluntary control activity on the part of those involved in the manufacture and distribution of drugs. The legislation should provide an incentive for such voluntary control. It would dramatize the Government's deep concern for those people who through temporary weakness and despair can get caught up in the narcotics cycle—primarily because abusive drugs are all too available. It would curtail the exploitation of such weakness by those who deal illegally in narcotics traffic, and in so doing, this legislation will indirectly contribute to important priorities in the Great Society; the reduction of crime and the elimination of poverty. I strongly urge the House to act favorably on this measure.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, yesterday the President of the United States outlined a proposed legislative attack on crime in the Nation.

Coincidental with that message, the House today is taking up a bill to crack down on the illicit trade in stimulant and depressant drugs—a vital factor in any national effort to depress the rising crime rate. I was pleased that the President singled out legislation of this type as an effective weapon in his anticrime program. The committee has worked hard on this legislation and is to be complimented for offering the kind of bill we can so enthusiastically support. I wish also to commend its chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], for his leadership in steering it through committee and to com-

pliment our fine colleague from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], the ranking minority member of the committee for his valuable contributions to this legislation. And I would like to pay tribute to our able colleague from New York, from my own county of Queens, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY], for his important role in bringing this legislation before us.

The objectives of this bill, with which I am privileged to be associated as a cosponsor, hit at the core of one of the worst scourges existing in this country today—drug addiction.

The nature of the drugs covered in this measure may not sound like the familiar narcotics with which the public is so familiar—such ravishing and destructive drugs as heroin and cocaine. But the so-called “goof balls” and commonly termed “pep pills” covered in this legislation are equally as dangerous—perhaps even more so. I say this because they are usually the first steps toward inevitable and advanced addiction.

The cost of these drugs becomes prohibitive and the pursuit of funds to pay for them, together with the distortion of rational thinking, leads to assorted crimes—thievery, mugging, prostitution, senseless killings. This tragic pattern is only too common.

I am particularly aware of this problem, Mr. Chairman. For several years I was chairman of the board of a New York City hospital—Riverside Hospital on North Brothers Island in the East River—whose sole purpose was the treatment and cure of juvenile drug addicts. Our only patients were youths—boys and girls under 20; yes, 12- and 13-year-olds who were addicted to heroin or other narcotics. Over 4,000 youngsters were processed through this hospital as patients—not 4, not 40 or 400, mind you, but 4,000 boys and girls—all drug addicts; many of them thieves, muggers, prostitutes and potential killers—and all in their teens. How tragic. And to think, with all our so-called scientific achievements we still don't have the effective answers as to how to keep them off these drugs.

In our Riverside Hospital treatment concept there was supposed to be a 3-year followup for aftercare, for rehabilitation. But this vital phase of the program was never adequately implemented. We were faced with the same old story—lack of facilities, lack of personnel, frustration, apathy, despair.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, we are still a long way from conquering the effects of this scourge, but there is no reason why we cannot conquer the initial stage. This bill will go a long way toward that goal.

How does it all start, Mr. Chairman? With the “goofballs,” with the “pep pills,” with the marijuana cigarette. It is always the same story. I have gone over hundreds of the case histories we have had at the hospital I mentioned. These cases are all a matter of record. Study them and you will see the pattern does not change. Yet it is so easy to obtain these goof balls, these pep pills—the barbiturates and stimulants we have been discussing today. Why, Mr. Chairman? Because of the inadequacy of our Federal

laws. Stringent controls are long overdue; we have the opportunity to provide them with this legislation.

It is encouraging that this amendment bill has been so enthusiastically received. The testimony which has accumulated points to the conclusion that we must act without any further loss of time to tighten controls and grant the FDA additional enforcement authorization.

There is no question but that the illegitimate operations involving various types of stimulant and depressant drugs have become a menace to public health and safety. The FDA Administrator has estimated that one-half of the 9 billion doses of drugs manufactured annually are diverted toward illicit use. Just imagine that.

Day by day news reports tell of senseless highway accidents, of suicides, of assorted crimes, of brutal killings caused by users of stimulants or depressants. Let me refer to a recent news story from Chicago which describes how three teenagers were arrested on charges of murdering an elderly gentleman; the whole noxious affair was punctuated by laughter on the part of the three murderers who, it turned out later, were beefed up by stimulant drugs acquired in the trade. One of the youths said the group was “hopped up” on goof balls.

Mr. Chairman, we do not exaggerate for 1 minute when we say the risks of the undercover trade are negligible, and unscrupulous operators have been pushing a multi-million-dollar business.

While law enforcement agencies have been concerned with narcotics, such as heroin and cocaine, there has evolved a perilous laxity in policing the traffic in ordinary depressants and stimulants, many of which are potentially as dangerous.

As pointed out in committee and on the floor there is an important legitimate medical use of these drugs. Barbiturates are depressants used when a sedative effect is desired. Amphetamines and similar stimulants are utilized in the treatment of depression and to control appetite, and tranquilizers serve to aid distress and mental disturbance. Unfortunately, widespread abuse of these agents has developed on an enormous scale.

Before the situation becomes even more acute, the Food and Drug Administration must be given more effective control powers. The legislation before the House would require all manufacturers and processors to keep detailed records on inventory and sales for instant investigation and search by FDA inspectors. It would become unlawful to possess these drugs unless it is intended for the personal use of the holder or his household. Stiff penalties are provided in the bill for violations. In addition, the measure calls for increased control over counterfeit drugs.

I venture the prediction that if this legislation is fully and forcefully implemented, the illicit trade in these drugs would begin to dry up. Because manufacturers and dealers are held accountable for every pill distributed, the easy access which has caused the problem can be closed to fraudulent usage.

Mr. Chairman, I am gratified that this important legislation has evoked such widespread support. I fervently urge overwhelming approval by the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. DWYER. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few remarks in support of H.R. 2, the Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965. Let me emphasize that the bill before us is of tremendous importance to the physical and moral well-being of the people of our great Nation. This bill provides increased control over the distribution of barbiturates, amphetamines and other drugs having a similar effect on the central nervous system. It also increases the authority of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare over counterfeit drugs.

These drugs are rapidly replacing the more strictly controlled drugs such as heroin as a principal cause of our drug addiction problem which is of epidemic proportions. I feel that this bill would strengthen the position of the public in its war against the illegal use and distribution of dangerous drugs.

Mr. Chairman, during the hearings on H.R. 2, it was pointed out to the committee that over 9 billion barbiturate and amphetamine tablets are produced annually in the United States, of which it is estimated that over 50 percent, or 4½ billion tablets, are distributed through illicit channels. It was stated several times with examples, facts, and figures that the abuse of these drugs increases juvenile delinquency, and substantially contributes to the rising crime rate in the United States.

This bill was unanimously reported by the committee, and the overwhelming bulk of the testimony presented has stressed the urgent need for more stringent legislation. Statements before the committee by representatives of the Government and industry alike favor the enactment of this legislation and its remedial suppression of drug abuse. The full scope of drug abuse cannot be measured because it affects not only the abuser but his family and the community around him.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that this legislation is eminently deserving of favorable consideration, and I join with my colleagues on the committee in recommending passage of H.R. 2.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Chairman, this may not be the most dramatic, the most controversial, the most expensive bill which this Congress will consider, but I doubt if anything else we do this year will pay greater dividends in terms of the public health and safety of our people, especially of our younger people of high school and college age.

The record of the hearings on the drug control bill—and I congratulate the chairman and the committee for assembling such a comprehensive, detailed, and factual record—leaves no room for doubt either about the urgent necessity for dealing with the illegal traffic in dangerous drugs or about the fitness of the proposed legislative solution.

No less than 4,500 million doses of amphetamines and barbiturates—at least 50 percent of the known annual production of 9 billion—are sold illegally on the black market.

These figures are very conservative. They do not include the substantial volume of drugs which never enter legitimate channels. Nor do they include related drugs, such as tranquilizers, which are just as dangerous, just as habit forming, and known to be just as subject to abuse. The estimates are based on incomplete and inadequate data from manufacturers, statistics which are more than 2 years old—a long period of time in a market which has been growing, as the Food and Drug Administration reports, "by leaps and bounds."

So we can assume, Mr. Chairman, that the extent of the drug abuse situation today is even greater than these figures might suggest.

The profits are as impressive as the volume. Although there is no "going rate" in this illicit and clandestine business, and it is impossible to determine precisely the margin of profit, conservative estimates indicate that the drug racket is producing at least \$500 million a year and probably more than \$1 billion. In general, according to the FDA, "goof balls" and "pep pills" can be bought at wholesale for less than \$1 a thousand. The cost is even lower when the capsules and tablets are manufactured illegally from the basic powders. At the opposite end, the individual dose will bring from 10 to 50 cents on the retail black market. In between, there is likely to have been an extensive and complex distribution network in which many greedy hands share in the proceeds.

There is much to share. As many of our colleagues may recall, CBS Television News last September exposed how easy it was to establish a black market operation. Using a dummy company with little more than a letterhead and \$600, CBS was able to purchase more than 1 billion doses of barbiturates and amphetamines from established manufacturers and processors valued on the black market at from \$250,000 to \$500,000.

Organized crime has moved into this lucrative racket in a big way. As the FDA has reported, professional crooks are operating extensive interstate networks, a development which has added a difficult new dimension to law enforcement in this field. In addition to the amateurs—the student with access to a parent's open end prescription, the part-time pusher, the street-corner salesman, the bars and truck stops—FDA inspectors and other law-enforcement officials must now deal with armed criminals.

The dimensions of this problem, Mr. Chairman, are huge. There are approximately 1,000 firms which manufacture stimulant and depressant drugs, about 1,300 drug wholesalers and branch outlets for manufacturers, 52,000 retail drugstores, 6,900 hospitals, 1,700 public health agencies, 230,000 physicians, 84,000 dentists, 15,000 veterinarians.

The great majority of these firms and individuals are completely honest and law abiding. But these are the points at which the diversion of dangerous drugs

from legal to illegal channels takes place. The illicit traffic in these drugs cannot be reduced or eliminated until diversion is controlled. This can be done only if law enforcement officials can determine the source, quantity, and destination of these drugs all along the distribution line.

The magnitude of the problem has dwarfed FDA's ability to cope with it under present law. The agency has only 56 inspectors assigned to this work throughout the country, hardly more than one per State. They cannot be armed. Their arrest powers are severely limited. Warrants cannot be served. The contraband drugs and the equipment used to make and transport them cannot be seized and condemned. Penalties for violations are weak, especially for those engaged in the dangerous and growing business of counterfeiting drugs. Jurisdictional limits under interstate commerce are unclear. Recordkeeping requirements are inadequate and virtually unenforceable. Unauthorized possession of these drugs is not yet prohibited by law. In many areas where diversion has been most serious, inspectors cannot even inspect the premises and records of those concerned.

In the face of these disabilities, Mr. Chairman, it is rather remarkable that the FDA has done as well as it has in trying to control drug abuse. The present bill, however, would equip the agency with a more enforceable statute and with the power to make it work. The requirements for registration, recordkeeping, and inspection are not unusual especially when we are dealing with drugs which can kill and maim and are so readily subject to abuse. Nor are the enforcement powers extreme. In general, they follow the pattern already established for controlling illegal traffic in narcotics and alcoholic beverages.

As a sponsor of drug control legislation in the 87th, 88th, and 89th Congresses, I have studied most if not all of the legislation which has been proposed to deal with this problem. I am convinced, on the basis of this experience, that the committee bill is good legislation—sound, moderate, and potentially effective. It is based firmly on expert advice and practical experience. It is designed to close loopholes and to enforce the law—nothing more. The fact that the bill is endorsed by virtually every concerned group, from drug manufacturers to local police officials, confirms both its necessity and its soundness.

Seldom, Mr. Chairman, have we known more about the nature of a legislative target than we know about the dangerous drugs. They are everywhere—in small towns and suburbs as well as big cities and slums, on college campuses, at high school parties, in the cabs of huge trucks speeding along crowded interstate highways. They are cheap and plentiful and available.

We know, too, what these drugs will do when used without a doctor's guidance. They are as addictive and dangerous as the hard narcotics. They are the agents of suicide. They induce prolonged psychiatric disturbances and generate abnormal and delinquent behavior.

Traffic accidents, larceny, violence—even murder—accompany the improper use of these valuable but dangerous drugs. The ruined lives, crippled bodies and disturbed minds which are left in the wake of these innocent-looking little pills add up to a compelling reason to enact this legislation, without weakening amendments and without further delay.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. DWYER. Yes, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to highly commend the gentlewoman from New Jersey for her very fine remarks and very appropriate statements on this very important and serious problem.

The gentlewoman is the sponsor of legislation along this line. A bill which she introduced was referred to the committee. Of course, we on the committee recall the capable and very fine testimony that she presented to the committee on behalf of this legislation. She has indeed rendered a commendable service for which we thank her very much.

Mrs. DWYER. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. DWYER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to commend the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey for the long interest she has displayed in this subject, and the devotion which she has shown here in Congress in introducing legislation and testifying before the committee and, indeed, the most excellent contribution she has made this afternoon in support of the pending bill.

Mrs. DWYER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful to have a few minutes today to join in urging enactment of a bill which, as the gentlewoman from New Jersey has just said, probably will be remembered as one of the outstanding bipartisan pieces of legislation enacted by this Congress.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. It should be said that in addition to the fact that the President included in his health message a request for legislation of this kind, only yesterday, as has been previously referred to, the President again in his message on crime alluded to this problem and made a request for legislation in this field. I want to have that statement in the RECORD. I think it appropriate at this point also to comment on the fact that yesterday the President asked for legislation contained in this bill, and today he will get it.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment briefly that so often we in Congress, when we go back home, hear the familiar words, "Why doesn't Congress do something about this?" I know that

we as parents and we who are not parents pick up our morning paper and read about the sudden exit into eternity of some souped-up kid in a souped-up car. We have read of a fiery funeral bier on the highway caused by a truckdriver who fed his stomach with goof balls as often as he fed the radiator of his truck.

We have read of old people, men and women, felled with chains, kicked and beaten by senseless youngsters who used these drugs.

The distinguished Members who have preceded me have done a splendid job in discussing this bill, but necessarily with such a broad subject it is necessary that the mopping-up crew come along and pause a little longer on one of the tiles of the mosaic and perhaps discuss it at some length.

What I propose to talk about is the question of counterfeiting. I think that is one of the most explosive elements in this whole problem.

Congress has been reviewing the problems involved in amphetamines, barbiturates and other depressant and stimulant drugs for over a decade. The tragedies which may occur from the nonmedical use of these drugs must be prevented. H.R. 2 will go a long way in achieving the controls desired to abate this menace.

This bill, however, is also designed to protect the public from the potentially explosive problem of counterfeit drugs. As President Johnson stated in his health message "Advancing the Nation's Health": "We must also counter the threat from counterfeit drugs." A counterfeit drug is a drug which is manufactured for the specific purpose of being passed to—and by—the retailer as the product of another manufacturer. The medicines that are counterfeited are generally the newer products that require the most careful controls in manufacture. But no drug is safe from counterfeiters. FDA has uncovered counterfeited tranquilizers, diuretics, blood pressure reducing, antidepressant, sedative, and anti-asthma drugs. Many types of counterfeits are illicitly sold for stimulating, depressing and mood-affecting characteristics. The drugs do not pass through the safety clearance or manufacturing control procedures to assure compliance with the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and, therefore, there can be no assurance that they contain the kind or amount of the drug supposed to be present. They are often adulterated, sub-potent, or dangerously overpotent. The consumer sold a counterfeit—possibly innocently by his pharmacist—is defrauded and his health is endangered. His physician may in turn be misled in his intended treatment by the different response of the patient to the drug from that which was intended.

Counterfeits are produced in establishments secreted from the view of law enforcement and health officers. The counterfeiter thus avoids the heavy costs that are involved in producing pure drugs.

Counterfeit drugs are made in precise simulation of well known and very valuable prescription items. The simulation

extends even to the use of the same monograms appearing on the genuine item and is so close that differences are discernible only by microscopic and chemical examination. Counterfeits may be sold unlabeled, often in paper or puffed bags or in partially filled bottles. The distribution is surreptitious. It imposes upon and depresses interstate commerce in legitimate drugs. Adequate control requires elimination of intrastate as well as interstate counterfeiting.

Special equipment for counterfeiting such as tablet dies and punches may be spirited from one location to another in an effort to avoid detection. H.R. 2 provides for seizure of such machinery to permit a counterfeit ring to be smashed when located. Otherwise, detection would only require removal of the equipment to a new base for the production and distribution of hazardous drugs to be resumed.

As I have indicated, marketing of these drugs is a bootleg operation. After being produced under conditions purposely hidden from inspection by the Food and Drug Administration and all other State and local officials, counterfeit drugs are distributed by equally devious means. No matter the route, however, the ultimate consumer receives a counterfeit drug in place of a trustworthy medicine.

For example, eight men and two firms were charged by the Justice Department with counterfeiting and distributing a variety of drugs, including two well-known tranquilizers. The tablets, though stamped and shaped to look genuine, were manufactured and labeled fraudulently and packaged in unlabeled bottles and bags. The shipments, labeled variously as "beads and machine tools," "ceramics," and "water softener" were distributed by car and freight in five States. Some of the individuals involved were prosecuted and convicted under New Jersey State law. The Department of Justice, for policy reasons, declined to prosecute under Federal law.

At an apothecary in Georgia, more than 3,000 counterfeit Dexedrine, Dex-amyl, and Diuril tablets were seized by the FDA. A Federal grand jury in New York indicted two men for introducing into interstate commerce about 60,000 counterfeit tranquilizers. The tablets looked like and were represented as being two well-known tranquilizer drugs, Mil-town and Equanil.

In June of 1964, FDA inspectors, aided by a reputable drug firm, arranged a contact with two persons known to deal in counterfeit drugs. A Federal officer agreed to purchase a substantial quantity of imitation drugs in a New Jersey air terminal for the supposed purpose of a later sale in Nebraska. After the "buy" was contracted, analysis showed the drugs to be counterfeit. Subsequent purchases revealed the location of a secret room concealed behind a movable stairway in the house of one of the individuals. A search of the premises yielded over 1 million counterfeit drugs and considerable drug manufacturing equipment.

The drug abuse control amendments will expressly prohibit the manufacture,

sale, distribution, and possession of counterfeits. By providing for the seizure of the machinery used in the illegal manufacture of drugs, the bill will permit FDA to effectively curtail the operations of the hardened criminals who participate in these illegal activities. The bill will also apply to intrastate commerce, thereby closing a serious loophole which has frequently impaired effective regulation. The enforcement provision of H.R. 2 for the control of stimulant and depressant drugs such as the power of arrest and seizure and the right to carry firearms will also apply to counterfeit drugs.

These provisions are especially needed because of the strict controls which will prevent diversion from legitimate manufacturers. Incentive to manufacture drugs clandestinely will be greater as profits to be derived from such operations will probably become even more lucrative.

Counterfeiting of new and potent drugs is increasing. It is a health menace. If permitted to continue the menace will grow. The provisions of H.R. 2 are urgently needed. I urge their enactment.

So if we ask what this bill will do to actually smash the evil thing that is going on in our country, in the one point I have just discussed we have a potent answer—we can destroy the equipment without which counterfeiters cannot counterfeit.

May I say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that whenever a dark and unwholesome habit is created in our country, there are always crawling creatures who will satisfy that appetite for a price. We have the opportunity here today, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee—we have the opportunity here today not only to strike down but to exterminate those crawling creatures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, which considered H.R. 2 and reported it favorably to the House, I support its provisions and particularly do I support its aims. The traffic in illegal barbiturates and amphetamine drugs has reached proportions which call for immediate and conclusive action. We could argue with conviction that the time for action was earlier, and that the enforcement agencies of our Government have done less than a thorough job of policing this illegal traffic. We could point fingers in all directions if we were looking for someone to blame for what is admittedly a bad situation. However, that is not the point. The committee has faced up to its responsibility and has brought before the House a bill that is a realistic measure to attack the situation.

The bill provides increased controls over the distribution of barbiturates, amphetamines, and other drugs having a similar affect on the central nervous

system. It is not the intent of this bill to bulldoze or strongarm any businessman who deals in these drugs in legitimate channels of trade. The bill provides for increased inspection requirements and the right of inspectors to inspect records. The bill makes clear that possession of these drugs outside legitimate channels of trade is illegal.

The committee held lengthy and complete hearings on this legislation. Testimony presented at the hearing indicates that over 9 billion barbiturate and amphetamine tablets are produced annually in the United States. Of this amount over 50 percent, or 4½ billion tablets, are distributed illegally through illicit channels. This is a shocking situation, reaching not just the large cities, but every community and town in the country. Drug abuse is associated with crime, juvenile delinquency, and highway accidents. The profits in illegal drug traffic are fantastic. In the hearings, it was pointed out that barbiturate and amphetamine tablets having a normal retail value of \$670 have a value of \$250,000 in illegal channels of trade.

Under existing law, these drugs may not be sold at retail to consumers except on a doctor's prescription. As a further aid for enforcement, H.R. 2 makes possession of these drugs a prohibited act, except where the buyer or seller is either in the legitimate chain of distribution, or possesses the drugs for his own use, or for use of a member of his household. Under present law, these drugs must move in interstate commerce before the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare can proceed against the illegal possessor, buyer, or seller. H.R. 2 eliminates this necessity.

A number of questions have arisen concerning the recordkeeping provisions of the bill. I do not feel there is cause for concern. The legislation specifically states:

No separate records, nor set form or forms for any of the foregoing records, shall be required as long as records containing the required information are available.

The prime purpose of this provision is to insure that the ordinary business records kept by the legitimate businessmen will be considered as adequate records for the purpose of this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this is fair, well-written, needed legislation. I am personally happy to have had opportunity to have a part in its development and the development of this legislative record.

I strongly urge its passage.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in favor of House bill 2 for control of amphetamines and barbiturates. Use of these drugs for kicks presents a great danger to our young people. Many of our teenagers and our college students take these drugs. Drivers who have to be up long hours often take amphetamines which actually for a time impart increased psychic and physical energy.

Barbiturates are used medically as sedatives and soporifics. Some people who take barbiturates, commonly called

by illicit users goof balls, redbirds, blue heaven, and yellow jackets, lose all inhibitions and are capable of committing almost any crime.

Combinations of both barbiturates and amphetamines are widely used. Among these combination users, a dream state is produced in which inhibitions are lost and the user again becomes a potential criminal.

Certainly this bill should be passed to remove the grave danger of either taking drugs for kicks or of habituation. Also, attention should be given in our changing civilization to employment of our youth in worthwhile projects or in recreation so that time will not weigh so heavily on their hands that they will be tempted to resort to the use of these drugs.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I believe this is the maiden speech of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky on the floor of the House of Representatives. The gentleman is an M.D., a practicing doctor. The gentleman has come to Congress and has been put on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. On that committee he has made some very fine contributions because of the technical nature of this bill and of other bills that are now coming before the committee, and he has been of special help.

I want to say to the gentleman, we are certainly proud that you are on the committee and making the kind of contribution you are making. For this we are very grateful.

Mr. CARTER. I extend my humble thanks to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. I also wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, not only for the fine statement he has just made to the committee in the House Chamber but also for the time, attention, and devotion he has given to this subject during the course of the hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and in the consideration of the bill in executive session. His knowledge in the field of medicine and pharmaceuticals as an M.D. brings strength to the committee.

I express my gratitude that the gentleman from Kentucky, as an experienced, practicing physician, is a member of the committee and can contribute so much to our work. We are glad to have you with us.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the distinguished chairman of our committee.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2, a bill to protect the public health and safety by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs and counterfeit drugs.

The distinguished Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is to be congratulated for bringing this legislation to the House and for the excellence of its report on the bill, which received the unanimous endorsement of the committee.

Although this bill treats only one phase of the problem of drug addiction, it represents an essential part of governmental efforts to protect the public health, and fight crime, and juvenile delinquency. These clearly have been shown to be stimulated tremendously by the unrestricted use of the narcotics covered by this bill.

We read with horror the committee's findings that more than "9 billion barbiturate and amphetamine tablets are produced annually in the United States, of which it is estimated that over 50 percent, or 4½ billion tablets, are distributed through illicit channels."

This bill may be but a way station in the campaign to control drug abuse. It is hoped that it will reduce abuses to the absolute obtainable minimum both through its recordkeeping and policing provisions and by spurring the drug industry voluntarily to tighten its vigilance over the distribution of the drugs it manufactures.

Of course, if the problem persists in a dangerous manner in spite of this legislation, stricter steps will have to be taken.

This bill is in full accord with the President's recommendation to the Congress, contained in his special messages on health and crime. The President's recommendation itself is the product of long and detailed study by numerous experts inside and outside of Government.

I endorse H.R. 2 wholeheartedly and urge its adoption by the House.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I join with our distinguished chairman, our ranking minority member, and all of the members of our committee in recommending to the House the passage of this legislation. The committee has considered it in extended sessions, in great detail, and I believe without question this is a bill which will help to answer the problem of illicit drug traffic in amphetamines and barbiturates and other drugs which affect the central nervous system.

I was amazed to learn in the hearings, as we started into this whole problem, that one-half of the production of these drugs goes into illicit traffic, as has been pointed out. Not just 1 million, 2 million, 3 million, or 4 million; not 1 billion, 2 billion, or 3 billion—but 4½ billion of these capsules go out of legitimate circles into the illicit traffic every year.

Of course this starts now with the manufacturer. Under the provisions of this bill, he must keep records for 3 years.

When the wholesaler applies for the purchase of drugs from the manufacturer, under the provisions of this bill, he must register with the Food and Drug Administration and must get a registration number, which must be included on his order blank to the manufacturer, so that the manufacturer will know right away that a legitimate party is asking to purchase. However, this does not relieve the manufacturer of taking whatever steps might be necessary, in addition to finding out about the registration number, to make certain that the wholesaler or purchaser from the manufacturer is a legitimate person authorized to receive the drugs.

I believe this step of requiring the registration number to be submitted with every order blank from a wholesaler to a manufacturer will cut off the major part of the beginning of the illicit drug traffic.

From there we go to the pharmacist, who now, under the provisions of the bill, is to be required to keep records for 3 years, although he now keeps records on these drugs which are prescribed by doctors. And this bill will allow inspection by Food and Drug Administration people.

Then, of course, any doctors who act as their own pharmacists, in effect, and sell drugs, would be required as pharmacists to keep the record, which would not apply to too many in the medical profession.

I think we should make it clear, in going down the distribution line for record-keeping to the pharmacist, that the committee has been very specific in setting forth what is to be expected. In fact, we actually say "no separate records nor set form or forms of any of the foregoing records shall be required as long as records containing the required information are available."

I know there is some concern by those in the pharmaceutical business, particularly the druggists, that the Food and Drug Administration may utilize this limited authority in H.R. 2 to accomplish broader designs. I know this is not the intent of the committee, but I would just like to confirm this with the chairman of our committee, that this does not in effect authorize fishing expeditions nor does it authorize recordkeeping standards to be imposed by the Food and Drug Administration upon the pharmacists of this country.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes, I yield to the chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is correct. I think if the gentleman will permit, it might be appropriate to state that for many years there has been a request from the Food and Drug Administration for the privilege of going in and perusing the records of the pharmacists. For all of these years, the pharmacists, as a great profession of this country, have resisted these attempts. I think there is something to be said for both contentions. In this instance we found, as I have earlier said, that more than 85 percent of the pharmacists do readily turn records over to inspectors as they come in

now on an inspection. So this group would have no concern or problem.

I think further it might be said that there is no intent on the part of the committee to permit or to suggest that there be any abuse of this privilege by the Food and Drug Administration. The pharmacists did express to us a feeling about the problem and particularly so since the medical profession was exempted.

We found from experience only about three per year in the medical profession had been prosecuted for violations in the last 10 years. During the course of the hearings it was revealed that on an average of about 100 or a few more in the field of pharmacy had proceedings started against them each year during the last 10 years. It was felt by the committee that the pharmacists as a profession should be given consideration as a profession, just as the medical profession, insofar as their application to the provisions of this bill are concerned.

So because of that, we felt that the better approach to the problem, would be to provide that those medical people, such as doctors, who engage in the dispensing of the drugs for profit as a regular business, keep records as is done by the pharmacists in the course of their regular business. So that the two are treated equally the same so far as this bill is concerned. There is no intent, in the case of either of these great professions in this country, to indict the profession as such. They are ethical groups largely operating as they should, in the interest of a great profession as well as the public whom they serve.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman. I knew that this was the feeling of the chairman as he expressed it in the hearings, but I simply wanted to make it very clear that the intent of the committee and of the Congress in this legislation is such that it should not entitle the Food and Drug Administration to harassment proceedings or any fishing expeditions, but rather the intent is exactly as it is stated in the bill, to follow the recordkeeping procedures in the matter of these prescriptions for these particular drugs.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. With regard to the detail men who call on doctors and pharmacists, what records will they be required to keep of the samples that they leave with the doctors or the pharmacists?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Of course, this bill requires recordkeeping from the beginning, from the manufacturer down to the wholesaler, and I presume from the wholesaler to the druggist, because most druggists deal with the wholesaler. They will have to show the registration number, from the wholesaler to the druggist. So there would be definitely a record of what drugs were kept and how they were disposed of.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the pharmaceutical companies employ detail men who call on the trade, usually the dispensing doctor or the pharmacist.

Would they be required to keep a record of the samples that they leave with these people?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The detail man would have to make a record what he gave someone, and then that record would be kept by his employer. This is a recordkeeping bill. For example, if a doctor writes out a prescription, that prescription—which is a form of record—has to be kept by the pharmacist. Without tight recordkeeping controls, we defeat the entire purpose of the bill. We require a record for each movement of this drug in the interstate chain.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, in the case of a physician who dispenses drugs, where a charge is made for the service and the drugs, if he dispenses it out of the original package that he had purchased from the wholesale drug house, then he would have to keep a record of them, as I understand it?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. What we are trying to do is not to put any undue burden on anyone. The provision concerning the doctor is simply in a case like this; where there may be no pharmacy nearby and therefore the doctor may make up his own drugs and prescribe them, he should keep a record. In the case of the doctor who uses a pharmacist, or perhaps a group of doctors formed so that they have a pharmacist set up within their own clinic, the pharmacist then would keep the record in that instance.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. In that case, where he is required to keep a record, would the samples that the detail man has left with the doctor be kept of record?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes, if the doctor is not within the bill's exempting language. It would be my understanding that he definitely would have to record them. Otherwise we would have a whole gap in our tracing of the drug, which this bill is designed to cover. He must keep the record.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. He must keep the record?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That is right—if the M.D. is one required to keep records under the bill, he would have to keep a record of samples.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Of all the drugs that he handles, amphetamines or barbiturates, he must keep a record of them?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes. In other words, we want to trace the drugs and the record should be kept.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me quickly get to two other points and then I shall conclude.

We have put a limitation on refills of prescriptions. We have found as a result of the testimony in some instances prescriptions have been made without any limitation as to time or any limitation as to the number of refills.

The committee, after hearing the testimony and going into the matter in some detail, thought it was wise to put this limitation of 6 months or five refills into the proposed legislation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the doctor prescribes a lesser number or a lesser time element, of course, that would prevail.

But in no instance is the prescription good longer than for a 6-month period or for more than five refills. If a person feels a need for an additional prescription, then he must check with his physician and either get another prescription by telephone or in writing—and it can be given orally for instance by telephone to the pharmacist, if the pharmacist immediately reduces it then to writing and keeps a record—we felt that was a reasonable provision.

Mr. Chairman, the last provision about which I want to discuss is the one dealing with increased penalties. We felt that the committee should emphasize the concern of the American people and the Congress with reference to dealing in these drugs with minors. Therefore, we have proposed increasing the penalties when minors are involved from 1 year and a fine of \$1,000 to 2 years and a fine \$5,000 for a first offense, and to 6 years and \$15,000 for an added offense.

Mr. Chairman, I am very hopeful that the Justice Department, after favorable action by the Congress on this matter, which I believe will be favorable, will bring to the attention of the Federal judiciary in a meaningful way to let them know that it is the feeling of the Congress in increasing these penalties that we do expect this sort of crime to be stopped and therefore have prescribed more severe penalties to help stop it. We have increased not only the fines but the jail penalties in order to get them to do something about this very serious matter.

Mr. Chairman, I am very hopeful that our Federal courts will start being a little more forceful in meting out penalties for violations dealing with this subject. Certainly, this is the intention of this legislation, that they put a stop to it if it is necessary through this method of increased penalties in order to stop this illicit traffic in these types of drugs.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a bill that will do a great deal toward accomplishing our aims in this matter.

Mr. Chairman, the industry itself is going to have to help to see that this legislation, if enacted, is carried out. However, based upon the indications which we have had in the testimony, the industry is more than willing to cooperate and wants to put a stop to the illicit traffic in these drugs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has again expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 2, as amended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, because, as the bill now stands, it contains every essential feature of my own proposed legislation on the control of the habit-forming, non-narcotic dangerous drugs which are today such a great national danger.

My proposed legislation on this subject is contained in section 6 of H.R. 1235, my omnibus bill to rewrite from

beginning to end the 27-year-old Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938.

My main regret today about H.R. 2 is that this bill contains only 1 of the 15 sections of H.R. 1235, and thus constitutes another instance of piecemeal approach to the glaring deficiencies of the outmoded Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

As I testified before the committee on February 10, during hearings on H.R. 2, the piecemeal approach which we have followed for so long in reforming the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and which we are continuing to follow in this instance, has delayed for many years our coming to grips with such vital concerns as the preclearance for safety of cosmetics; the preclearance for safety and effectiveness of therapeutic devices; the long-overdue tightening of requirements for factory inspection for foods, cosmetics, and nonprescription drugs; the effective outlawing of deceptive practices in labeling and packaging of foods, drugs, and cosmetics; the cautionary labeling of foods, drugs, and cosmetics against hazardous uses or for the provision of first aid information where needed; and a host of other reforms spelled out in detail in H.R. 1235.

The chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], has performed an outstanding public service in connection with the barbiturates and amphetamines and other habit-forming dangerous drugs covered by H.R. 2, and I congratulate him and his committee for the manner in which H.R. 2 has been strengthened in committee since its introduction on January 4. It is a good bill. I do not see how anyone could oppose it. It does not go too far in its restrictions, because they are necessary to protect the public health and safety.

I am only sorry, as I said, that this bill was not expanded—after appropriate hearings—to include most, if not all, of the other provisions of H.R. 1235. Chairman HARRIS was most gracious when I discussed this matter during the hearings, and promised that when and if the White House, or the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, indicates as much interest in cosmetic safety, and in therapeutic device safety and effectiveness, and in the other provisions of H.R. 1235 as was demonstrated by the administration on the pep pills and depressant drugs, that he would be glad to give sympathetic consideration to the question of scheduling more extensive hearings than were arranged for H.R. 2.

I am, therefore, going to do my utmost to convince the women of this country—and I say that now with full knowledge of the irresistible force I am summoning to my aid—that they must deluge the President, the Secretary of HEW and their representatives in the Congress of the United States with a barrage of letters, postcards, telegrams, telephone calls, and personal visits, too, where possible, to generate greater interest in and concern for the problems which H.R. 1235 would attack.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the male Members of the House will consider themselves fairly warned. The women of this

country have been unprotected for far too long from the danger of unsafe cosmetics being placed on the market without adequate testing. All consumers—not just women—are endangered by unsafe medical devices of all kinds, also marketed without the necessity for advance testing for safety, and there is no reason for this condition to continue.

There are many other features of H.R. 1235 which deal with long-standing deficiencies in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, and which all consumer groups in the country strongly support.

Four years ago, when I first introduced H.R. 1235, I pleaded with the then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to get behind that bill as an administration measure. I was assured by the Secretary, and later by one of his young emissaries, that the administration would act expeditiously to promote consumer legislation of this kind, although I was told that it would not be feasible, for some reason, to endorse my bill as such.

A year and a half later, administration bills, in almost all respects similar to H.R. 1235 were finally sent to Congress. By then, it was too late to get action on broad legislation in the 87th Congress, but we did—thanks to the thalidomide tragedy—succeed in passing one portion of this legislation, dealing only with prescription drugs.

In the 88th Congress, although I reintroduced H.R. 1235 and although President Johnson followed President Kennedy in sending to Congress a consumer message endorsing most of the same proposals, nothing was done on any phase of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

When I reintroduced H.R. 1235 in this Congress on January 4, I again went to see the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to plead for administration assistance and support. But, as Chairman HARRIS told me during hearings on H.R. 2, there has not yet been any great show of interest "downtown" on the broader legislation. A young man came to me from HEW a week or so ago to say that the administration has not lost interest in this legislation—and I believe that. But where is the push? This bill which is before the House today, H.R. 2, is something like a mustard plaster applied to the ailing Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. It serves a useful purpose. But we have to enact much more than this bill in order to strengthen the law on consumer safety.

I know that Mrs. Esther Peterson, the President's Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, strongly endorses and supports basic reforms in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, such as those contained in H.R. 1235, and her encouragement has been of great help to me.

Where, then, is the foot dragging taking place? If the Department cannot accept or agree to everything in H.R. 1235—and I admit that there are some controversial features which go beyond administration commitments made so far—then why can it not suggest changes or amendments in this bill—so that we can get on with the job of rewriting our terribly out-of-date consumer statute?

Unfortunately, in the 4 years since I first introduced H.R. 1235, the Depart-

ment has never even filed a departmental report on it, although it was specifically requested by the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in both of the last two Congresses, and was specifically promised to me 4 years ago by the young man who was sent by HEW at that time, to tell me that H.R. 1235 could not be made the administration bill, even though the administration endorsed most of the things in it. The report has never been filed.

Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent obtained in the House, I submit as part of my remarks, the testimony I gave on February 10 on H.R. 2. In that statement, I called for strengthening of H.R. 2 in a number of important respects, and I am glad to note that the bill as now before us contains these added provisions. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has done a good job in improving the bill to provide stronger enforcement tools. The committee and its chairman once again deserve the thanks of this House for their work on legislation to protect the public health.

The testimony follows:

**A SERIOUS GAP IN OUR LAWS—BUT JUST ONE OF MANY**

(Testimony by Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN before House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on legislation to tighten controls over habit-forming depressant and stimulant drugs, February 10, 1965)

Chairman HARRIS and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you this morning. The legislation you are considering is of vital importance—vital in the literal sense that our lives are in danger from the continued widespread illicit traffic in barbiturates, amphetamines, and the related central nervous system depressant, or stimulant drugs. We know that many of the head-on crashes on our superhighways—where a car or truck will suddenly career across the median strip and plow into a car going the other direction, wiping out entire families—can be attributed to more than just fatigue on the part of one of the drivers. As the work of the Food and Drug Administration has demonstrated, illicit sales of the so-called "pep pills" at highway stops are so common that the use of such drugs constitutes a real and present danger to everyone who ventures out on a highway.

The barbiturates and the amphetamines serve very useful medical purposes when properly used, and nothing in this legislation, of course, would interfere with the doctor's freedom of action in prescribing such drugs or with the patient's opportunity to buy them through legitimate channels. But when the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration testified—as he did before this committee—that probably one-half of the 9 billion doses of barbiturates and amphetamines manufactured in this country in 1962 ended up on the bootleg market, then, Mr. Chairman, we are compelled by our responsibilities as Members of Congress to wipe out this bootlegging of pills which are major causes of highway homicide, which also serve as handy-dandy little suicide kits, and do-it-yourself instruments of mental illness and delinquency among youth.

Of course you are not going to wipe out all traffic in instruments of homicide and suicide and crime no matter what kind of legislation you pass, but I want to point out—before someone raises the question of firearms regulation and we get into a long and emotional controversy on a completely different issue—there is nothing in the first amendment about the right of the public to

buy any kind of poison they want to. In fact, we have many laws—including the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act—which severely restrict the manufacture, distribution, and sale, of unsafe products in commerce, and we have other laws which prohibit the illegal possession of narcotics regardless of whether they moved in interstate commerce.

We must stop the illegal traffic in non-narcotic drugs which are frequent substitutes for narcotics and which when abused are habit forming and dangerous not just to the user but to the public. The legislation before you will go far toward accomplishing that purpose. It prohibits unauthorized possession of the pills, permits surveillance of all stages of production and distribution, and establishes criminal penalties for violators, particularly for sales to youths.

**STRONGER PROVISIONS IN H.R. 1235**

Commissioner Larrick pointed out in his testimony certain changes which he would recommend in H.R. 2, the bill introduced by Chairman HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that one of the sections of H.R. 1235, my omnibus bill to rewrite the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, contains all of the provisions of H.R. 2 on control of the dangerous and habit-forming depressant and stimulant drugs, and, in the respects cited by the Food and Drug Administration, also contains language covering most of the points raised by Mr. Larrick.

For instance, my bill permits seizure of any drugs for which there are not proper records as required under the proposed law. There are safeguards in the bill to protect legitimate manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers, of course, but the burden of proof would be placed upon them to prove legal ownership of any drugs for which they failed to keep proper records. Under such tight restrictions, I cannot imagine half of the annual production of 9 billion doses disappearing out of legitimate trade channels.

H.R. 2 would extend to Food and Drug officials the right to carry firearms under certain circumstances in the administration of this new section of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. H.R. 1235 would go further, as Commissioner Larrick urged, and give such officials the powers not only to execute and serve arrest warrants, and execute seizure by process issued pursuant to libel; but also to—

(a) Make arrests without warrant for offenses under this legislation "if the offense is committed in the officer's or employee's presence or if he has probable cause to believe that the person so arrested has committed, or is committing, such offense";

(b) Make, prior to institution of libel proceedings, "seizure of drugs, containers, or conveyances if such drugs, containers, or conveyances are, or if he has reasonable grounds to believe that they are, subject to seizure and condemnation" under the law, provided however that libel proceedings be instituted immediately thereafter.

Mr. Chairman, these are very strong powers, but they are not excessive; they are similar to the powers now held by alcohol tax agents and by narcotics agents. In the case of habit-forming dangerous drugs so widely bootlegged, we are dealing with criminal syndicates and hoodlums. Without such powers, the evidence can quickly disappear before warrants and libels can be issued.

**FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT NEEDS MAJOR OVERHAUL**

My purpose in coming here this morning is not just to suggest the substitution of the stronger provisions of section 6 of H.R. 1235 for H.R. 2, as a tighter bill and more inclusive in fighting bootlegging of these dangerous drugs. I am even more brash than that.

Mr. Chairman, I first introduced this barbiturate-amphetamine control legislation more than 4 years ago, so I am very anxious to see such legislation become law. I know that

the chairman of the committee has also been a sponsor of such legislation for a number of years. But, we both recognize—and I hope all of the members of the committee also recognize—that the situation with regard to these dangerous mind-affecting drugs, while very serious, is only one of a whole series of important problems which now exist in the administration of effective food, drug, and cosmetic regulation.

We have put a lot of blowout patches on the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 over the years, but the act itself needs a major overhaul. Instead, we have usually taken up one issue at a time, one Congress at a time. In 1954, we passed the bill on pesticides, but nothing was done on cosmetics, or on food additives, or about other glaring gaps in the law.

In 1958, we passed a Food Additives Act, but again did nothing about cosmetics safety, or any of the other deficiencies in the act.

In 1960, when the lipstick makers came rushing in for help, we quickly passed the Color Additives Act, requiring that all coloring matter in foods, drugs, or cosmetics (except hair dye colors) be proved safe before being used, but to this day we have done not a single thing to assure the pretesting for safety of any other ingredient in cosmetics.

In 1962, under circumstances I do not have to recall for this committee—which worked a legislative miracle in getting the legislation through under tremendous difficulties—we closed the major loopholes in the clearance of prescription drugs following the thalidomide disclosures, but once again we did nothing about cosmetics, or barbiturates and amphetamines, or therapeutic devices or any of the other major loopholes in the basic act which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Commissioner of FDA have repeatedly deplored. I included these things in my omnibus bill as long ago as 1961. The chairman of this committee also proposed many of these things in legislation he also introduced in the 87th Congress.

I introduced an omnibus bill in 1961 after having introduced separate bills on cosmetics in four previous Congresses, when I became convinced we were proceeding too slowly by taking up only one phase of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act in each 2-year term of Congress. This is our basic consumer protection statute. It is 27 years old. Many provisions of it are obsolete. Some sections were bad 27 years ago, and are worse today. Yet we have approached this vast problem a nibble at a time, a Congress at a time, even conceding that some of the acts which you have sponsored in these past 10 years, Mr. Chairman, have been very important and very sizable bites indeed. But we haven't ever done since 1938 the kind of job done by this committee 27 years ago—that is, take a good, hard look at the entire act on foods, drugs, and cosmetics, and weed out the obsolete portions and replace them with effective provisions which truly protect the consumer in today's economy rather than that of 27 years ago, when technology and marketing were far different.

**MAY BE ONLY CHANCE TO AMEND ACT IN THIS CONGRESS**

In my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 26 I spelled out these necessary and long overdue changes, as called for in H.R. 1235. In that statement, I went into detail on all of the provisions of my omnibus bill, and the reasons why the health and safety of the public, and the interests of all consumers, require passage of an omnibus bill such as H.R. 1235, rather than another piecemeal approach as in H.R. 2.

My plea is this: Please extend the scope of these hearings to include all phases of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act requiring improvement and amendment. You have made a fine, early start in this Congress on a most important aspect of the problem. But

I am fearful that if we pass H.R. 2 by itself, that may be the only part of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act we can get to in this Congress. For I am mindful of the heavy legislative responsibilities of this committee in so many other fields—transportation, aviation, natural gas, power, the Public Health Service program, railroad retirement, communications, the Securities and Exchange Commission and the other regulatory agencies, and the fact that once you put this one aspect of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act behind you, the press of hearings on other issues may make it impossible to go back to this subject. At the pace which has been followed in the past, it may be years before we can complete action on such major loopholes in the law as those applying to:

1. Therapeutic devices, which can be marketed today without proof of safety and without proof of effectiveness and which, in many instances, are tools for the victimization of the elderly and sick, as Senator WILLIAMS' committee on the aging reported just last week;

2. Cosmetics, which can also be marketed without prior clearance for safety, except insofar as the coloring matter is concerned (and in the case of hair dyes, the colors can be virulently dangerous just so long as the label points out they may not be safe for some people to use);

3. Worthless dietary foods, another major source of defrauding the elderly and ill;

4. Factory inspection for foods, non-prescription drugs, and cosmetics: The same loopholes in these fields which we closed for prescription drugs in the Kefauver-Harris Act of 1962;

5. Deceptive labeling and packaging: The public is really becoming aroused over the tricks which can be perpetrated under the present law. I firmly believe that if we do not solve this problem through the non-controversial features of section 2 of H.R. 1235, you will soon be faced with tremendous demand for much more stringent regulation;

6. Cautionary labeling of foods, drugs, and cosmetics: Now exempt under the Hazardous Substances Labeling Act so that no information need be supplied on possible dangerous uses or misapplications, or on first aid steps to be followed in case of mishap or accidental ingestion, particularly by children.

There are many other changes in the basic Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 called for by H.R. 1235, including a proposed ban on interstate commerce in flavored or sweetened aspirin, a major cause of accidental poisoning of children under 5. In extending my remarks, I will list all of these provisions. But for right now, I fervently ask that you expand your hearings on H.R. 2 to include all phases of the act, and give our consumers the first real top-to-bottom review in 27 years of the many deficiencies in this statute.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I want to compliment the gentlewoman for her continuing interest and the tremendous and vast amount of work she has done on this subject and subjects related thereto affecting the consumers of this country.

We on the committee and in the Congress know of her interest not only in the field of drug abuse and controls, such as we have under consideration here, but in the omnibus bill which she has introduced and to which she has referred, now pending before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The distinguished gentlewoman has made an outstanding contribution in

this field, and we owe her a debt of gratitude. It will be recalled that in the last Congress she also was interested in the field, and testified before the committee. I introduced at the request of the administration in the 87th Congress not only a bill on drugs and drug controls, but also an amendment to the Food and Drug Act relating to cosmetics, on which as the gentlewoman will recall we conducted extensive hearings. It was a highly controversial proposition. Because of the keen interest and the controversial aspects of the bill, we were unable to accomplish the purposes which were originally sought by the administration and the gentlewoman from Missouri.

In the health message this year, the President did include a request for legislation in the field of cosmetics, as the gentlewoman knows. Thus far we have not received the legislation from downtown to carry out each phase of the recommendation, but I assume in due time it will be introduced, then the committee can get to it. When hearings are held, the gentlewoman from Missouri will be given an opportunity to come back to the committee and continue her determined efforts in this field.

I compliment the gentlewoman, and I thank her for the testimony she has given before the Committee and the contributions she has made for which we all owe her a deep sense of gratitude.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I thank the chairman. I know he has been most cooperative, but I am going to start a little private fire under the bill at the White House to see if we can get this accomplished in shorter time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KORNEGAY].

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2.

For several years now the newspapers, magazines, and scientific and medical journals have carried articles on dangerous drugs. These articles have reported on the tragic effects resulting from abuse of these drugs, the connection between drug abuse and juvenile delinquency and the rising crime rate, and the dangerous potentialities of the so-called tranquilizer drugs. Most of us recall the recent newspaper publicity about the two West Virginia teenagers who went on a wild crime spree through the South. While under the influence of amphetamine drugs, which act as a stimulant on the central nervous system, these boys brutally murdered a responsible businessman who offered them a ride and wrapped his nude body in a roll of wallpaper in an abandoned house in Georgia. Because of the drugs the boys will die in the electric chair.

Last summer, six Chicagoans were arrested for the murder of a town marshal in Downey, Idaho. According to an article in Chicago's American last July, the 6 left Chicago on a 5-State crime spree stealing 50 cars and committing 70 burglaries. All six constantly took pep pills while on their rampage. The marshal, a father of five, was shot down when he surprised them burglarizing a county store. One of these six hood-

lums is the son of a respected Chicago police sergeant.

The July 23, 1964, issue of Chicago's American carried an article by Michael McGovern describing the ease with which pep pills can be bought in Chicago, especially from druggists. The list of articles of this type is endless. The Gallatin, Tenn., City News of April 13, 1961, carried a story of the seizure of over 14,000 depressant and stimulant pills and the destruction of a local bootleg drug ring by police. The September 16, 1960, edition of the Newark, N.J., Evening News tells of the arrest of four teenagers who were selling stolen "goofballs" to other teenagers. About 10,000 pills were involved here. The arrest of a man unlawfully handling several thousand amphetamine tablets was reported in the Jacksonville, Fla., Florida Times-Union on May 13, 1961. The February 7, 1963, edition of the Cincinnati Enquirer reported the arrest of a druggist and a bartender who were believed to be supplying teenagers with amphetamines. The Columbus, Ohio, Citizen-Journal, dated July 7, 1962, told the story of a 16-year-old girl police found wandering aimlessly through the streets, clad only in a blouse. Subsequent investigation led to the arrest of 14 juveniles and adults. It appeared that the adults were supplying young girls with whisky and amphetamines during the course of wild sex parties.

The Louisville Courier-Journal of July 7, 1962, quoted the family of two young cousins as blaming the boys' habituation to amphetamines for their murdering two innocent persons. The cracking of a dope ring which involved 100 children at the Glen Burnie, Md., high school was reported in the July 10, 1962, Baltimore News-Post. According to this article, police confiscated at least 8,000 pep pills. The Knoxville, Tenn., Journal of September 15, 1962, reported the arrest of two service station attendants who were supplying local high school students with amphetamines. Fifty-two thousand amphetamine tablets were involved when local police arrested a man and his wife in Gardena, Calif., for violation of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. These arrests were reported in the Gardena Valley News on May 14, 1964. The San Diego, Calif., Union of July 30, 1964, carried a story of a 20-year-old amphetamine and barbiturate user who was convicted of murdering his mother and crippled 12-year-old sister with a rock and baseball bat. On August 16, 1964, the Nashville Tennessean ran an article on the use of amphetamines by college students. A correction officer trainee at the California Institution for Men in Chino, Calif., was arrested for supplying barbiturate tablets to inmates according to an article in the Los Angeles Times on September 3, 1964. Many of us are aware of last fall's CBS reports on the Walter Cronkite television program which reported how a bogus corporation was set up through which vast amounts of barbiturates and amphetamines were ordered without trouble. Although this fake company paid only slightly over \$600 for these drugs their black market value was estimated at \$250,000 to \$500,000.

Mr. Chairman, these are just a few of the many reports of the horrible consequences resulting from abuse of readily available depressant and stimulant drugs.

Popular magazines have also reported on these dangers. An article by Robert Goldman entitled "Instant Happiness" appeared in the October 1963 issue of *Ladies' Home Journal*. This well-written article points out the dangers involved in the nonmedical use of LSD-25, tranquilizers, barbiturates, and amphetamines. Mr. Goldman concludes that far too many Americans go through life looking for an emotional crutch, and they find it in these drugs. The January 3, 1964, issue of *Time* magazine, in its "Medicine" section discusses the deadly combination of alcohol and barbiturates and how the two combined can kill an unsuspecting person.

LSD-25 and the scandal at Harvard University was thoroughly discussed in Noah Gordon's article "The Hallucinogenic Drug Cult," which appeared in the *Reporter* of August 15, 1963. Two crackpot professors at Harvard who were giving the dangerously potent LSD-25 to undergraduate students formed a group called the International Federation of Internal Freedom. The organization is engaged in disseminating information about the "wonderful" properties of this drug among college students. It is also indicated that this association of warped individuals has been involved in the illegal distribution of the drug. Many of the young students who participated in drug "sessions" had to undergo psychiatric care. One student told of sex orgies taking place while the group was still under the drug's effects. Another student kept a journal during these "sessions." He is reported to have said:

Later I read it and it was horrible. People were tearing each other apart. Also, I felt I was reading the worst pornography I ever read.

Still other students told psychiatrists of participating in homosexual activity while under the influence of this drug. This article tells of another student who took one of these drugs and for 2 whole days thought that he was only 6 inches tall. During this period he was entirely helpless and had to be cared for by friends. It is absolutely shocking that such things could go on at a university with Harvard's reputation. If these things happened there, what is going on at all of the other institutions of higher education throughout the country? The sooner we pass H.R. 2 and put an end to this type of thing the better off the country will be.

The scientific and medical literature has carried many articles warning of the dangers of the so-called tranquilizers. The *Science News Letter* of January 30, 1965, warned of the tendency of several widely prescribed tranquilizers to cause addiction. As far back as December 9, 1960, the toxicity of meprobamate—Miltown, Equanil—was discussed in the *Medical Letter on Drugs and Therapeutics*. Drs. McKown, Verhulst, and Crothy, all members of USPHS's National Clearinghouse for Poison Control Centers, stated in the August 10, 1963, *Journal of the American Medical Association*

that "it becomes evident that the popularity of tranquilizers as suicidal agents must now rival that of barbiturates." An article by Drs. Schremly and Solomon appearing in the 189th volume of *Journal of American Medical Association*, 1964; reported on a study conducted at the Boston, Mass., City Hospital. Almost one-half of the drug abusers and addicts reported used the drugs covered by H.R. 2. The others abused narcotics. Dr. Joel Fort in the 16th volume of the *Bulletin on Narcotics*, 1964, and Dr. Ernest Hamburger in the 189th volume of *Journal of American Medical Association*, 1964, stated that tranquilizers, like barbiturates, can cause tolerance and psychic and physical dependence.

The few articles that I have mentioned are by no means all that have appeared in the past few years. Many other publications have carried stories showing the need for a bill like H.R. 2.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come to vote the passage of this urgently needed piece of legislation. To my mind, the time is long since overdue. But now that we have the opportunity, let us end this horrible traffic in human misery and perversion. This great body will do the Nation a real service by passing H.R. 2.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KORNEGAY. I yield to my good friend the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. I wish to compliment the gentleman on his statement. I agree entirely with what he has said.

I am happy that my experiences in Cambridge were not comparable to those the gentleman has described.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina on the speech that he has made. I agree with him thoroughly and I enthusiastically support the objects of this legislation.

I want also to compliment the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, for bringing this important bill to the floor for passage.

At the same time, I know that members of the committee will not object if I say a word of praise for my distinguished colleague from Connecticut in the other body, Senator THOMAS J. DODD, who has been working in this legislative field for some 4 years and who successfully carried legislation of this type through the other body last year. Senator DODD's subcommittee has made studies of this critical problem which plagues our adolescents, and his work, when added to that of the distinguished House Committee on Interstate Commerce, has prepared the ground for the unanimous support which H.R. 2 finds here today.

I was struck by the quotations of Harvard professors and students which the gentlemen from North Carolina just gave us. I am happy that nothing of this type occurred in Cambridge when I was a student there.

Like the gentlemen, I read some of these statements when they were first issued and I was shocked, as he has been. If this legislation should make such puerile experimentation impossible, this alone would justify its passage.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, as I look into the mirror of my mind, I see reflected the bright, shining, and happy faces of teenagers I know and have known, some of them close to my own family. I see too, the many pitfalls that can take the brightness from their faces and erase their happiness and that of their loved ones. Certain of these pitfalls cannot be avoided; I am thinking now in terms of disease. We, however, as protectors of our youth, can do much to assure that the danger inherent in such exposures are minimized, and we, as a matter of course, do these things. We immunize, inoculate, and counsel and advise, and we are rewarded for our efforts by a measure of success in keeping the bloom, the shine, and the happiness in our children's faces.

The efforts manifest here today indicate our acknowledgement that another pitfall, a threat to the well-being and security of our youth, has reared its ugly head. In the past, oftentimes, people have ignored controversial, abnormal, and antisocial behavior until it created a major crisis. Then society has acted, perhaps better described as reacted, in haste to eliminate the evil, to strike down the threat, and the steps taken have not always been wise, or practical, or realistic. I am happy to say that in my opinion the bill before this House today does not fall into the category I have just cited. H.R. 2 is well conceived, well designed, clearly thought out, and necessary to support our family efforts in fighting the insidious onslaught of the pep pill and goof ball threat to our society. This legislation, in section 7, directly and positively provides for ample penalties to those who, for the sake of money or other selfish gain, prey upon our youth by inducing them to take a few pills for kicks.

Numerous lurid and disgusting cases have occurred. Rather than list them, I would like to take just a minute more and briefly sum up the end result of the injudicious and illegal traffic in these depressant and stimulating drugs as they effect our American youth. In addition to the traumatic and debilitating effect they have on the physical, moral, and mental qualities of the teenage users, they have a far reaching and costly effect on society. These losses are both direct and indirect; the former exemplified by automobile accidents and by the increasing cost of crime; the latter by school dropouts, suicides, accidental deaths, pregnancies out of wedlock, and by sexual deviations and other sexual crimes. A particularly tragic outcome, in many instances, is the transposition that individual youths make when they switch from the amphetamines and barbiturates to the hard narcotics.

Please note that illegal use of goof balls and pep pills knows no boundaries; they are found in large communities and small communities, and in rich communities and in poor communities. Therefore, if we earnestly wish to keep the bloom of innocent youth on our young

people, and I am convinced we do, we have two courses of action we must take—first, as responsible family heads we must continue to provide guidance to our young, and second, as Members of this Congress, we must band together and act favorably on this most important bill that is now before us.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend our able Chairman for the clear and forceful manner in which he has presented this drug abuse bill which I strongly support. He has held long and careful hearings, and I think our committee has come out with a bill we can all support. It is neither too harsh; nor too easy. But it does set up specific controls over the distribution of these barbiturates and amphetamines. It is high time that we establish and require that full records be kept, and reports made on the distribution of these drugs. The Food and Drug Administration likewise is to be commended for their leadership in proposing more rigid controls over these drugs.

All the laws in the world, however, will not compensate for the dependence we have developed for too many pills and drugs. Modern medicine and science has given us the greatest medicine of all ages. We are indebted to these men of science who have eliminated so many dreaded diseases in our time. We are indeed fortunate people that so many wonderful drugs are available to protect our national health.

But we, as a people, have become sort of pill happy, in too many instances. Gone is the day—perhaps wisely—when our medicine chest consisted of a few aspirins, a bottle of Vicks Vaporub or Mentholatum, a bottle of castor oil, and a small vial of iodine or monkey blood. To round it out, all we needed was a bit of cotton and adhesive tape, and our mothers could fix any hurt or illness. Now, though, we must have a hundred pills for every ailment—real or imaginary. We abuse our bodies and our minds, with the full reliance on the wonder drugs which will erase any violation we might have committed. We insist that the doctors give us a special pill to cure all ills; and the doctors, often to please and humor us, prescribe a quick cure. Our medicine chest looks like a wholesale druggist bargain counter. Our social status is measured by the quantity of special pills we possess. We have a pill to pick us up—or let us down; and sometimes we have both pills working on the other—and on us—at the same time. No wonder our nervous system is as restless as a windshield wiper.

Of course, these pills all have their place and we should be thankful that our laboratories have made them available. But, we also must realize what we are doing to our national health. The abuse we have allowed to develop on these two medicines—barbiturates and amphetamines—is one example of the overuse or overdependence on the various wonder drugs. This law will help to control the distribution of these pills.

The best thing we can do, however, is put on a campaign to reeducate the public to the dangers of carelessly or needlessly consuming too many pills. We

ought to teach our children that there is danger in taking these happy pills. What can be considered a lark might turn into a tragedy. And we could all heed this advice ourselves.

It is my hope that our schools, all news media, the medical profession and laboratories, parents in particular and the public generally, will view with alarm any overindulgence of the happy pills. This might be the best thing that can come from this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN].

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, The legislation we are considering here today has been carefully designed to serve a very special and urgent need. This need is not one that is limited to my community and State. This is a need of all of the American people. It is a need to which we must respond unanimously, and without delay.

We have ample evidence of the seriousness of the drug abuse problem. The evidence is staggering. Almost daily, Mr. Chairman, the story unfolds.

This is a story of violence and crime. It is a story of misery and heartbreak. It is a story of a type of antisocial behavior which can destroy the youth of America.

My real concern, however, is not to echo the almost unanimous agreement which I sense in this body concerning the need for new controls to combat the public health problems stemming from abuse with these drugs.

My concern, Mr. Chairman, is to satisfy myself, without any reservation, that the legislation we are considering here today will adequately respond to this need.

I have searched for many answers in reviewing House Resolution 2.

Does this legislation recognize and respond to the need for regulating not only interstate, but also intrastate commerce in these drugs? The answer is "Yes."

Does this legislation spell out, with unimpeachable clarity, what a stimulant or depressant drug is, thus providing for direct and unchallenged enforcement? The answer is "Yes."

Does the legislation recognize that these drugs are valuable therapeutic agents and, as such, can be legitimately possessed and used as prescribed by a physician? The answer is "Yes."

Does the legislation call for extraordinary precautions to prevent these drugs from getting into the black market? The answer is "Yes," and I would like to add here, Mr. Chairman, that in my opinion the recordkeeping provisions of this bill provide for a concerted attack against the evil at all levels, and will control effectively every step in the distribution process from manufacturer to consumer.

Does the legislation recognize that from time to time certain substances will be found to have a potential for abuse because of their depressant or stimulant effect on the central nervous system, and as such should be subject to the controls of this bill in the same manner as is the case with amphetamines and barbiturates? The answer is "Yes," and here again Mr. Chairman, I would

like to compliment the authors of this legislation, and committee members, of both majority and minority, for the care and fairness they have shown in spelling out the procedures under which drugs can in the future be placed under control of the act.

Does the legislation recognize the necessity to penalize severely the deplorable practice of illegal drug sales to juveniles? The answer is "Yes." Increased penalties are provided and should help to deter an illegal sale by an adult to a juvenile—and thus to hit the illegal traffic at its most despicable point.

Does the legislation face up to the problem of counterfeit drugs in the same firm manner in which it approaches the hazards incident to drug abuse? The answer is "Yes." Here again, Mr. Chairman, regulation will be pursued whether the drugs are in interstate commerce or not.

And finally, Mr. Chairman, does this legislation strengthen the enforcement powers of the Federal agency in dealing with these problems? Specifically, does the Food and Drug Administration have, under the provisions of this bill, all the authority it needs for proper enforcement? Once again, the answer is "Yes." This legislation grants FDA inspectors the power to arrest with and without warrants, to execute seizures with and without libels of information, and to carry firearms when conducting inspections and investigations relating to these drugs. Provisions also have been made to seize and condemn the machinery and equipment used in the illegal manufacture of these drugs.

To summarize, Mr. Chairman, I think we can be satisfied that the vital legislation before us is adequate in all respects, and should serve well to meet the grave threat posed by the uncontrolled abuse of dangerous drugs.

And now, Mr. Chairman, before closing I would like to provide a few words of caution. I have spoken to the scope of this bill, and I hope it will prove adequate as written. We can, however, seriously jeopardize the objectives of the bill if we permit special-interest groups to whittle away at the basic strengths of the legislation with the sharp knives of concession and exemptive language.

If this drug abuse problem is to be solved, it must be solved with a strong, uncompromising law. To enact such a law, we cannot favor one group or one special interest over our duty to protect the interests of all citizens.

Indeed, it may be that further tightening of regulations will be needed to close a gap in control of drugs consigned for delivery to foreign buyers. Many such shipments find their way into the illegal market after leaving a bonded warehouse—never reaching the international border.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is one of the most important pieces of health legislation to come before Congress. On July 15 of last year, President Johnson expressed his desire that the full power of the Federal Government be brought to bear upon the destruction of the illegal traffic in drugs, and the prevention of drug abuse.

I find it particularly encouraging, Mr. Chairman, that we are giving this matter high priority in the 89th Congress.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I became convinced a number of years ago, when I served on a special Ways and Means Subcommittee looking into the drug problem, that the illegal sales of sedatives and stimulants constituted a growing problem which required Federal legislation because of its national nature. I joined then in introducing legislation designed to regulate more closely the sales of barbiturates.

I am pleased, therefore, to join in the support of the bill before us today establishing special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs. We must work toward control mechanisms which will limit the sale and use of these dangerous drugs to those who will benefit from them—under strict care of their physicians.

It is shocking to learn that over half of the 9 billion barbiturate and amphetamine tablets produced annually are distributed through illegal channels—with many winding up in the hands of those, particularly younger people, who use them for a "thrill" and become addicted to them. When taken in excess, they have dangerous effects upon emotional control and are contributing factors to a climbing crime rate. As the President said in his message on crime only yesterday:

Senseless killings, robberies, and auto accidents have resulted from the radical personality changes induced by the indiscriminate use of these drugs. Because they are less expensive and more available than narcotics, these drugs appeal to a much broader cross section of our population, particularly the young.

We must seek effective ways to control the illegal sale of these dangerous drugs. I believe the bill before us is a step in the right direction and I will vote for it.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. HUOT].

Mr. HUOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2. I would like to refer the Members of the House to the startling figures given before the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee by Commissioner George P. Larrick of the Food and Drug Administration and which our distinguished Chairman from Arkansas has pointed out that over 50 percent of the barbiturates and amphetamine distributed in this country annually are distributed through illicit channels. This amounts to over 4½ billion tablets per year. These so-called goofballs and pep pills have been demonstrated to be closely linked to the problems of juvenile delinquency, the rising crime rate, and automobile accidents.

In light of these facts, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce could well have been justified if it had considered legislation similar to the rigid controls placed upon so-called hard narcotics. However, the committee has chosen and wisely I believe, to report out a bill which will substantially reduce the illicit traffic in these drugs with a minimum of interference with, and inconvenience to, the honest and concerned pharmaceutical houses, hospitals, wholesale and retail druggists. For example, there is no requirement that anyone in the chain of distribution maintain separate records as long as records containing the required information is available. These records include inventory and records of receipt and distribution and in the case of retail druggists; prescription orders. I have been assured by retail druggists in my district that they, as a matter of routine and State law, now keep these records which will be required under H.R. 2. According to the statement of Mr. Ralph R. Rooke in behalf of the National Association of Retail Druggists, a majority of the States already require the maintaining of these records.

On the problem of highway safety this strikes close to everyone. Few people are not exposed to the dangers of highway travel at one time or another. As more roads are built and as traffic increases on them the dangers tend to increase proportionately.

But there is one menace that has grown all out of proportion. That is the uncontrolled use of dangerous drugs. I speak specifically of the use of "pep pills," "bennies," and amphetamine drugs, barbiturates, and other sedatives.

In recent years these pills have become more and more available. A business that got its start in roadside truck stops and diners now shows evidence of having gone "big time." And well it might. When a product can be purchased for less than \$1 per thousand then sold on the wholesale bootleg market for \$30 per thousand, expansion is inevitable.

To further complicate the problem of widespread availability is the common apathy toward the hazards involved in the use of amphetamine drugs. "Bennies" or pep pills are often thought of as no more harmful than a cup of coffee. This is a dangerous misconception.

Amphetamines are useful drugs and have considerable value in the treatment of certain illnesses, when used under medical supervision. When taken by a driver who is trying to stretch his run, the effects can be tragic.

In the hearings last month on H.R. 2 before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee we heard about a typical result: On Friday, November 2, 1962, at 5:45 in the afternoon, a truck, a tractor-trailer unit, operated in interstate commerce in Ohio on the Willow Freeway, which is a freeway just south of Cleveland, crossed a 33-foot center strip on a clear, level stretch of the road and went over on the other side of the highway. It struck three cars. These were pushed into two others. There were six schoolteachers in one of the cars. All

six were killed. In addition four other persons were injured. A total of six vehicles were extensively damaged. The driver of the tractor trailer unit was apparently asleep at the time of the accident, with indications that he was under the influence of pep pills. He later admitted he had amphetamine drugs to keep him awake.

This tragedy need not have happened. The pattern in cases of this type is encountered all too often. The driver has been behind the wheel too many hours. He is tired, physically tired. His body needs rest and tells him so. He is sleepy. For reasons of his own he decides to push on and as he has done many times before, he takes a couple of the "bennies" he bought at the last stop. He feels better. The normal protective feelings of fatigue are still present but they are now hidden beneath the mask of the stimulant drug he has taken. He feels alert, but he is nervous and irritable. He is working mechanically, like a sleepwalker. As the effects begin to wear off he takes more pills. His body continues to use its reserves until, like any other delicate machine that is pushed beyond the limit of its endurance—it collapses. In the case of the pill-taking driver, it could happen while he is driving. He becomes a zombie. He may black out partially or completely, with his eyes wide open. He may experience hallucinations, pull out to pass an object that does not exist. And then it happens—innocent lives are lost.

Pill taking is undoubtedly responsible for many tragic wrecks from single accidents to multiple death, head-on collisions.

We cannot underestimate the widespread nature of this problem. Amphetamine and barbiturate pills can be dispensed only by prescription. Testimony before the committee indicates that in some areas they are sold as freely as aspirin.

One source of amphetamine pills is through truck stops. I must point out here that the use of the term "truck stop" is in a rather loose and general sense. There is no accepted definition. Anyone with a shack and a fuel pump or even a bar or diner without a fuel pump can call itself a truck stop, because trucks stop there. The truck stop caters to all kinds of people, occasionally serving as a distribution center supplying other markets as well as young people.

Where bennies are sold at truck stops it is often by a waitress who knows every regular customer. The seller may be a cook, a dishwasher, or mechanic. In some cases it may be a transient pusher who comes in, takes a seat, and peddles from his coat pocket. Some drivers can and do become distributors themselves, buying pills where they are available and selling them at a profit elsewhere along the road. These illicit drug sales plague police in every area of the Nation.

The impact of illegal drugs on highway safety is not limited to truckdrivers and others who use pep pills. We are all familiar with the menace of the drunken driver. Countless State and local campaigns are launched each year in effort

to control this hazardous violator. Excessive use of barbiturates and other sedative drugs can produce symptoms similar in some respects to alcoholic intoxication. These drugs are often readily available through illicit channels. These drugs are useful medicines; however, they are habit-forming and by law can be sold only upon prescription. Uncontrolled use can lead to addiction. Barbiturates such as seconal are often "pushed" by underworld peddlers promoting experimentation knowing it may lead to habitual use addiction to true narcotics and another "hooked" customer.

A person who uses barbiturates excessively often becomes drowsy and confused. He cannot coordinate his muscular action when he walks or stands. He may experience tremor of his hands, lips, and tongue. He has difficulty in thinking or talking clearly. A person so affected is obviously unfit to drive.

The enormity of the hazards created by excessive use of these dangerous drugs can only be estimated. It cannot be ignored. Truckdrivers and many others who constantly use the highways are victimized by unscrupulous and illegal dealers in drugs for the enormous profits involved. They place personal profit above human life. This illicit traffic must be stopped. I believe the bill before us offers a proper and reasonable method of getting it stopped.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY].

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Chairman, as a newcomer to Congress, I have been impressed with the vigor, intelligence, and forcefulness with which this Congress has tackled this new danger that is riding on our highways and threatening our countryside. Before coming to Congress I was aware of the abuse of amphetamine and the barbiturates, but the committee hearings disclosed that the dimensions of this problem are much greater than most of us realize.

The people of Georgia have more than a passing interest in the subject matter of this legislation, because only recently one of these bizarre crimes was committed which shocked the State. A husband, father, and businessman as an act of mercy picked up two young men, who proceeded under the influence of these drugs to beat him to death and leave him to die. This crime was avenged by trial, and both young men are now under sentence to die in the electric chair. The sum of this was a mass tragedy which affected many families, and this just might have been averted if we had had this legislation that is before us now.

We can only hope that the enactment of this bill into law will drastically curb traffic in these drugs and the consequent tragedies, but I think it should be acknowledged by this legislative body that more than legislation and enforcement will be required if we are to be spared the daily occurrence of such crimes. Parents, teachers, doctors, adults, and young men and women must be able to recognize the physical danger and moral wrong involved in taking these drugs. The

education of all our people in personal health and hygiene is a necessity.

I have examined this bill. I have listened to the testimony before the committee. I commend it to the other Members of Congress, because I think that it is well considered legislation. At least Congress will have this opportunity to reduce this terrible scourge.

Mr. Chairman, I support H.R. 2. It is a bill intended to bring under control a group of drugs that has great usefulness when employed properly by physicians but these drugs, the barbiturates, the amphetamines, and certain other stimulant and depressant drugs are habit-forming. Physicians are alert to the dangers of excessive use of the drug and I am advised that under proper administration there is little, if any, danger that patients under a doctor's care will become addicted. However, the drugs have the ability, particularly when used in excessive amounts, to enable the user to escape from reality and some people take 4, 5, and even 10 times the normal therapeutic dose to give them a "kick," to impart a sense of well-being, or, as one addict has recently said, to put them in heaven. It is when these excessive quantities are employed, and especially when they are used frequently, that we have addiction to the habit-forming, stimulant, and depressant drugs.

Now there are always some people that will go to almost any lengths to secure a crutch that will help them escape from reality. We still have some traffic in narcotics after half a century of the most vigorous and stringent enforcement. It probably would be too much to expect that H.R. 2 is going to wipe out all underground traffic in the habit-forming, stimulant and depressant drugs. What it is intended to do, and I believe what it will do, is to eliminate the bulk of the illegal traffic in the drugs. It will wipe out most of the promiscuous peddling of these pills in many sections of the country. It will cut down the business of free sales of the pills around schoolyards and playgrounds where juveniles today frequently become acquainted with and addicted to the products.

To accomplish these purposes, H.R. 2 sets up a system of careful recordkeeping which will cover all manufacture and all commercial distribution of the stimulant and depressant drugs. The recordkeeping to be required is, aside from an initial inventory of stocks on hand when the bill goes into effect, simply the recordkeeping that is presently conducted by responsible business.

Manufacturers would be required to note the quantities of the drugs that they manufacture, to whom they are shipped, and in what quantity. They do this today.

Wholesalers would be required to keep the records they receive from manufacturers covering incoming shipments of the drugs; they would keep copies of the records they supply retail druggists and other customers showing outgo of the products. They do this today.

Pharmacists and dispensing physicians who perform the functions of pharmacists likewise would be required to keep records of the receipt of the drugs and

the prescriptions filled for them. Pharmacists do this today as part of their normal operating procedures. Certainly anyone who attempts to take over the function of the pharmacist likewise should do it.

Some question has been raised as to the necessity of making the records of pharmacists available for inspection. Clearly this is necessary if we are to accomplish the control which the evidence of the past several years shows must be instituted to curb traffic in these drugs. Testimony from a representative of the National Association of Retail Druggists before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee shows that the retail drugstores are presently subject to inspection of State inspectors. Some have suggested that State activity is all that is required. If that were true, we would not have the appalling illegal traffic in barbiturates and amphetamines today. Some States have inadequate law; some States have good law and inadequate enforcement personnel; some have laws and enforcement personnel and for other reasons do not achieve effective control of this menace. We have tried State enforcement. It has not worked. It would not be completely effective if all States had good laws and more personnel because the traffic in these drugs does not respect State boundaries. We have a national problem that requires a national approach.

Further testimony before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee by Food and Drug Commissioner Larrick is that the prescription files in pharmacies are inspected by many groups of individuals. The police have authority to inspect, the narcotics inspectors have such authority, the Alcoholic Tax Unit inspectors have this authority, and in many drug stores, according to the Commissioner, the pharmacists even allow the detail men or salesmen of drug manufacturing establishments to come in and inspect prescription files in order to find out how the competition is doing.

I see no reason why a profession that accepts without objection this degree of examination of its prescription files should raise the slightest objection to authorization for Federal Food and Drug agents to make such reviews as are necessary to detect diversions of habit-forming stimulant and depressant drugs to illegal channels. As a matter of fact, Commissioner Larrick also testified that reputable pharmacists do not object to inspection of prescription files by his agents now. It is the people who have something to hide that do not want our Food and Drug agents to find out what goes on in their drugstores.

There is no question of invasion of professional relationships. Our Government agents are well-trained, well-qualified professional individuals. The American Medical Association has raised no question about their examination of prescription files, and no other responsible group that I am aware of has any real concern about this matter.

In my view, Mr. Chairman, the provision in H.R. 2 allowing an audit of all commercial transactions in barbiturates

and amphetamines and related drugs is essential if the basic philosophy of the bill is to succeed. You cannot contain water in a bucket that has a hole knocked in one side, and you cannot contain the traffic in these drugs by an audit system that has a loophole relieving from the audit over 50,000 possible points of diversion to illicit channels.

Most physicians do not regularly engage today in the dispensing of prescription drugs for a fee. There are, I understand, some sections of the country in which it is still necessary for the physician to act as his own pharmacist and dispense drugs regularly for money because there is no accessible drugstore. In these instances, the doctor takes over the function of the pharmacist and of course the doctor would be expected to meet the same requirements that apply to pharmacists in other parts of the United States. But the bulk of the physicians of the country would not be affected by the recordkeeping provisions of the bill and clearly the legitimate practice of medicine, both in populous and sparsely settled areas, would not be interfered with under the law.

We have developed here a substitute, and I believe an adequate substitute, for the much more rigorous controls that are applied currently to the hard narcotics. I would hope that through cooperation of all who are engaged in manufacturing and distributing the habit-forming stimulant and depressant drugs, it would be possible to achieve control of the problem without resort to the more stringent narcotic type of regulation.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this legislation is urgently required. I know that it has been very carefully considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I support it and I urge my colleagues to support it also.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN].

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I advocate increased controls over the distribution of depressant, stimulant, and hallucinatory drugs and of counterfeit drugs. I support H.R. 2 as being a great step forward in accomplishing increased controls.

Abuse in the distribution of these drugs is cumulatively creating problems of abnormal and antisocial behavior, highway accidents, juvenile delinquency, and broken homes. It is a paradox that these drugs that are so very useful in the restoration of health are also capable of inducing pathological behavior when subject to abuse.

The report of a congressional committee of the 89th Congress investigating traffic in, and control of, narcotics, indicates that barbiturates, or "goof pills" and amphetamines, or "thrill pills" are as much concern to the Nation as are the addicting narcotic drugs. According to some medical opinion, barbiturates, or "sleeping pills," are the most dangerous of all habit-forming drugs, even more dangerous than morphine, cocaine, heroin, and marijuana combined. Barbiturates are known also to cause other evil effects, from a weakening of the memory, or depression, or irritability, to death.

If a person needs more than two sleeping pills at a time, he might be a barbiturate addict, and not know it. So declares Dr. Ronald Koegler, research psychiatrist at UCLA's Neuropsychiatric Institute. He points out that at least 1 million persons take sleeping pills, and that up to 25 percent of all these are unsuspecting addicts. Further, he emphasizes, barbiturates have a much greater deleterious effect on the body than heroin, and for the habitual user the mental deterioration can be equal to that of heroin.

The easy money and profits gleaned from illegal traffic in amphetamines and barbiturates spawned organized rings to bootleg these drugs. This illegal traffic developed primarily along truck routes. Truckdrivers learned that the use of these drugs permitted them to drive for longer periods without rest or to make more trips per week. Unfortunately, they did not realize that, while the drugs stimulate the nervous system, they do not eliminate physical fatigue. These drugs mask fatigue, and ultimately the driver suffers seriously impaired reflexes, dangerous hallucinations, or periods of semiconsciousness while driving. As a result, there is a rising toll of death on our highways in horrifying accidents.

The gentleman from New Hampshire has already cited certain examples, but there are others. On July 19, 1963, an automobile carrying an Air Force sergeant, his wife, his 6-year-old son and 8-year-old daughter, approached a checkpoint established by a highway commission traffic survey near Tipton, Iowa. The automobile pulled to a stop behind a truck. A few moments later a tractor-trailer crashed into the rear of the automobile and drove it under the truck in front where it burst into flames. All members of the family in the automobile were mangled and charred beyond recognition. The driver of the tractor-trailer was not injured. Three bottles of amphetamine drugs were found in his suitcase in the cab of the truck. He admitted purchasing and using the drugs during the trip. Blood tests proved that he was under the influence of amphetamines at the time of the accident.

Another accident occurred on the West Virginia Turnpike on January 8, 1964. A tractor flatbed crossed to the wrong side of the highway and collided with an oncoming mobile post office killing drivers of both vehicles as well as three persons who were working in the mobile post office. Investigating officers found amphetamine tablets in the luggage of the tractor flatbed and analysis revealed the presence of amphetamine in the stomach contents of the tractor driver.

Most of our accidents in general aviation in truth are not accident at all but rather full-fledged cases of unintentional suicide and manslaughter, says Flight magazine editorially, May 1963.

An example of such an accident was cited in the instance of a pilot who took off in spite of warnings of bad weather and soon crashed into a mountain. Since there was no fire, investigators were able to determine the cause, finding in the pilot's pockets Dexadrine pills, barbiturates, and thyroid extract. Tests showed that, beyond a shadow of a doubt, the drugs were a factor in the

pilot's condition and his refusal to heed the advice about the severe weather.

Federal authorities estimate that half of the 9 billion pep pills and barbiturates produced annually by U.S. drug manufacturers find their way into illegal, nonprescription channels. The Federal Bureau of Narcotics reports that the decline in narcotics usage in some States has been accompanied by a proportionate increase in the overuse of pep and sleeping pills.

The excessive use of barbiturates and amphetamines is not only harmful to individuals but presents a serious social problem.

Women in Connecticut, according to State Health Commissioner Franklin Foote are secretly using barbiturates and tranquilizers to such an extent that the addiction is referred to as "housewives" disease. Mr. Foote estimates that at least 4,000 women in the State are addicted to these drugs.

Juvenile arrests in Los Angeles for involvement in dangerous drugs such as barbiturates and amphetamines increased from 50 in 1958 to 426 in 1961, a rise of 752 percent.

Many persons, particularly youths, take drugs along with beer or hard liquor for what is medically known as their synergistic effect—in other words, increased "boot." Jerome Trichter, assistant health commissioner of New York, says:

This doesn't mean that one beer or cocktail plus one "goofball" will merely double the alcohol's effect. The combination works in a geometric way and, depending on the individual, may create four or more times the effect of either the drink or drug when taken alone. This, naturally, can lead to unexpectedly sudden and severe intoxication, resulting in every sort of erratic and irresponsible antisocial behavior.

One of the newer substances, LSD-25—lysergic acid diethylamide—is the most powerful hallucinogen ever discovered. It cannot be sold legally yet, law-enforcement officials have found it being smuggled into the country and sold in a black-market operation.

Its effects are bizarre. Doctors say LSD has triggered violent psychoses and suicides. "It can produce an unstable state—varying—within 5 minutes—from horror to ecstasy," according to Dr. Jonathan Cole, of the National Institute of Mental Health.

The amazingly potent chemical, LSD, little understood, has become the latest kick for those who seek wild experiences. In some cities, LSD has achieved the status of a cocktail-party fad, a magnet for curious campus cults, a one-shot, do-it-yourself psychoanalysis, "instant magic" for the bored and the disenfranchised. A single dose is minuscule but its effects last 12 to 18 hours. Within a half an hour the LSD user begins a visit "to the antipodes of his mind." He begins to sweat, his heart accelerates, he may see flashing colors, lightning. He may become sexually stimulated, confused, silly, violent, excited, elated, contemplative, or depressed.

A brilliant young graduate student in physics went to an LSD party in New York, took the stuff in a sugar cube and went wild. He tore off his clothes in

the street, fought policemen, and had to be handcuffed, straitjacketed, and hospitalized.

The increasing addiction of teenage youths to amphetamines and barbiturates is alarming. An 18-year-old girl picked up in Newark, N.J., said she had been on these pills since she was 14 years old. She estimated that 60 percent of the teenagers in her group were also users.

Increased controls over the distribution of the depressant, stimulant, and hallucinatory drugs is a must. H.R. 2 gives increased controls and should in my judgment, be passed.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLIGAN. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. I am very happy to note this afternoon the interest and participation in this debate of the new members of our committee. The gentleman has just given another fine example of the capable and outstanding Members who have come to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce this year.

The gentleman from Ohio was preceded by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. MACKAY], who also gave a very fine description in one field of activity of this legislation. Immediately prior to that, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. HUOT], a new Member, covered other aspects of this important subject. Other new Members have spoken, such as the gentleman from Kentucky [Dr. CARTER], whom I complimented earlier.

It certainly seems to me a fine thing. As chairman of the committee, I want publicly to thank all of you who have recently come on the committee for the attention and devotion to duty and service you have displayed as we have gone into this important problem.

I look forward to receiving a lot of help from you—and I know I will get it—in the future on the many important bills we will consider.

I express my thanks to all the new Members as well as the other Members who have heretofore been familiar with these problems for the attention, for the help, and for the fine work you have done on this legislation.

Mr. GILLIGAN. On behalf of the new Members, Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Illinois if he will yield me 3 minutes to answer a question?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DOW] has been concerned about one provision of this program and how it might affect one of the manufacturers he is quite interested in and his people are concerned with. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOW].

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding. I address his attention to page 24 of the proposed bill. In subsection (v)

there is a definition and in subsection (1) under that the definition reads this way: "any drug which contains any quantity of (A) barbituric acid or any of the salts of barbituric acid;"

I should like to inquire of the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce whether they would entertain an amendment to insert the word "substituted" before barbituric acid where it appears in two places in that clause. By this means, of course, the definition in this paragraph would exclude unsubstituted barbituric acid, and that is the purpose of my question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will yield, in response to his question I will say to the gentleman that our report on page 6 contains a statement which should alleviate any further concern that the gentleman may have. The report contains this language:

While the bill would apply to all depressant or stimulant drugs, it would not apply to basic chemicals intended and used for nondrug purposes.

I understand that is the problem that the gentleman has with the industry to which he refers. The report goes on:

For example, firms that ship or receive unsubstituted barbituric acid or other potentially depressant or stimulant drugs for industrial nondrug purposes would not be subject to the recordkeeping and other requirements of the bill.

I further call to the attention of the gentleman, in order to make this matter abundantly clear, so that his constituent need not be concerned, that in the hearings on this bill, H.R. 2, on page 372, there is a letter addressed to me as chairman of the committee from Mr. H. Kent Vanderhoef, vice president of the Kay-Fries Chemicals, Inc. I believe the gentleman is familiar with this correspondence.

We referred the matter to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for its reply, and on page 373 of the hearings there is contained a reply from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare signed by Mr. John L. Harvey, the Deputy Commissioner. That letter is dated January 27, 1965. Then subsequent thereto there is an additional letter from Mr. Harvey dated February 17, 1965, on this subject.

I refer the gentleman from New York to these communications further to assure him that he has no need to fear any problems with regard to this bill insofar as the industry he refers to is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DOW. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me the additional time, but I shall not need that much time.

I should like to say that I heartily support the drug bill that has been offered here today. I feel very certain this will be the answer to the anxiety of a great many of my constituents who are troubled about the sale of illicit drugs.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 2, now under consideration by the House.

This measure, known as the Drug Abuse Control Amendments, seeks to accomplish exactly what its title states, namely, to establish better Federal regulation and control over the distribution of depressant and stimulant drugs which affect the central nervous system. It also seeks to strengthen the drug enforcement authority of the Food and Drug Administration.

In his message to Congress on January 7 of this year, President Johnson discussed the need for various health measures and proposed a comprehensive national health program, including also more effective drug control measures. In the latter category, he requested the enactment of legislation to control the manufacture and distribution of barbiturates, amphetamines, and other psychotoxic drugs. These drugs, when taken in excessive amounts, act as intoxicants, cause hypertension, tremor, insomnia, and in some instances psychosis and hallucinations. The chronic use of such drugs is known to produce loss of coordination and to impair a person's judgment.

During hearings by the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on this measure, Commissioner George F. Larrick, of the Food and Drug Administration, pointed out that while these drugs have important therapeutic value the abuse and misuse of such drugs has contributed to the "rising toll of deaths on our highways, juvenile delinquency, violent and bizarre crimes, suicides, and other antisocial behavior." Others testified that about 50 percent of the drugs produced each year in the United States are distributed through illicit channels at fantastically high prices.

The bill under consideration would seek to establish more adequate control, better enforcement, and the elimination of the abuses now in effect. Perhaps the most noteworthy phase of this legislation is its aim to eliminate the substantial illicit traffic in these drugs in the effort to protect the American public, its health, and its safety.

At this point, I want to pay a well-deserved tribute to the Honorable THOMAS J. DONN, senior Senator from my State of Connecticut, who is recognized as a pioneer in the effort to regulate and control the distribution of dangerous drugs in the interest of public safety and public health. Four years ago, in 1961, he introduced legislation to deal with this problem and subsequently conducted hearings through the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency. His efforts then and in subsequent years now bear fruit. Senator DONN deserves public thanks and appreciation for his untiring efforts to protect the health of the American people against dangerous drugs and the illicit traffic in such drugs. The youth of our country should be particularly grateful to him.

I urge the adoption of this legislation as an important step forward in the effort to solve the Nation's health problems.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am proud indeed to cast my vote in support of H.R. 2, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

This legislation, designed to prohibit the illegal manufacture, sale, and distribution of barbiturates and amphetamines which have a potential for abuse to the public, is long overdue.

Upon the enactment of this legislation, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will now be empowered to investigate, regulate, and classify drugs as depressants or stimulants. Drugs receiving such classifications will be subject to closer supervision through improved recordkeeping, inspection, and possession controls.

It is a tragic fact of life in midcentury America that hundreds of thousands of teenagers have ready access to "goof balls" truckdrivers take "pep pills," housewives and businessmen resort to tranquilizers or stimulants at increasingly frequent intervals, with the result that too often the users of these drugs become unable to function as rational human beings.

With the enactment of this law, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare can define the potential for abuse of these barbiturates and amphetamines and will have jurisdiction, as well, over that area wherein individuals may now take drugs on their own initiative, without prescription or medical advice.

It goes without saying that the potential for crime in an unrestricted or loosely controlled market for these depressants and stimulants is staggering. Each of us is familiar with the statistics on the subject showing the direct relation between drugs and civil and moral disorder. We read the stories in the Nation's newspapers daily.

Concern for this critical national problem prompted President Kennedy to establish an Advisory Commission on Narcotics and Drug Abuse in January 1963. The recommendations of this Commission, plus the results of other independent and federally sponsored studies, and the deep concern shared by the Congress, made this legislation possible.

H.R. 2 is not designed to prohibit the possession of these drugs by individuals who have a sound medical basis for using them. Rather, it is designed to combat illegal traffic in these drugs at all levels. With additional safeguards as concern recordkeeping and inspection controls, we will be able to prevent these drugs from falling into the hands of the irresponsible.

This bill contains limitations on refills of prescriptions, as well. Under this legislation, a prescription issued after the effective date of this legislation would be valid for a period of 6 months and could be refilled only 5 times. Doctors would then be required to reauthorize similar prescriptions at 6-month intervals.

Additional safeguards have been incorporated into this legislation to expand and implement the ability of the State and Federal Governments to enforce the law.

I urge my colleagues to join in supporting H.R. 2 as an important step forward

in our continuing concern with crime, juvenile delinquency, and the Nation's health and well-being. I urge this action because many agencies in Chicago have urged controls over the traffic in "goof balls" and "pep pills." Also, Mr. Chairman, the press and radio in Chicago, particularly radio station WIND, have urged adoption of stricter controls over the traffic.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965".*

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT] having assumed the chair, Mr. MOORHEAD, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2) to protect the public health and safety by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include extraneous matter in the revision of my remarks in Committee of the Whole today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so many include extraneous matter in the extension of their remarks on the bill today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### PER CAPITA DISTRIBUTION OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FUNDS

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am speaking again today on the subject of the geographic distribution of Federal research and development contracts and grants to further emphasize that the national interest demands attention be directed to what is taking place in this vital area of economic activity.

I have previously discussed this distribution as a percentage of the contracts and grants awarded to particular areas. I have discussed this distribution on the basis of the percentage of funds received by particular areas.

Today I believe it will be enlightening to look at a comparison of the Federal research and development dollars with relation to the populations of the various States. In 1963 the 12 States represented on the Midwestern Governors' Conference received little more than 11 percent of the research and development funds. These 12 States include Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas. Of these 12 only 1, Missouri received a per capita distribution above the national average of \$53. I might add it was only \$1 above the national average. The next highest was \$23 in Wisconsin and the lowest was \$3 in Nebraska. My own State of Indiana received \$11 per capita.

In fact, there were only 10 States which topped the national average, 1 in the East, 1 in the South, 1 in the Midwest, and 7 in the West and Far West.

This picture of the geographic distribution of Federal funds which now total up to almost 15 percent of the entire national budget is a complex one but it is nevertheless one which demands serious consideration be given to it. In this particular comparison we find our most populous State, California, receiving \$220 per capita and two others but \$2 per capita.

It is not my intention to contend the distribution of such funds should be made on a per capita basis. But I do contend this is one more measuring stick which emphasizes the words in the report on the Subcommittee of Science, Research and Development:

That there is a suggestion of an uneven geographical distribution of research money, sufficiently uneven to cause hardship in some areas and result in undesirable concentrations when weighed from a national point of view.

#### THE SELMA, ALA., SITUATION

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, America cries "shame" upon the people of Alabama for the ruthless and bloody attack by their State police upon the Selma marchers. The illegal police action—and I call it illegal even though it was done under the cover of law—their illegal action is a stench in the nostrils of every decent American.

This is not a rule by law. It is rule by intimidation. It is a flagrant abuse of powers granted public officials. It is an unwarranted provocation against decency and justice.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to believe that such viciousness can exist in this

day in the United States. It is difficult to believe that the people of Alabama condone such brutality.

I insist, Mr. Speaker, that there are grounds for intervention by the Attorney General in this matter. Such excessive police brutality does not only permit his intervention, it demands it.

#### THE ISSUES AT SELMA

Printed and televised pictures and verbal accounts have brought us not only the news of how Alabama State troopers and Dallas County sheriff's men met an orderly column of Negro demonstrators setting out to walk from Selma to Montgomery, the State capital. They have brought us also a sharp sense of shame and outrage that public officials in the United States should so abuse their powers.

What happened on the outskirts of Selma was the application of force—police clubs, tear gas, whips, shoving by horses and uniformed men—to Americans whose only offense was to take to the public roads to walk to the capital of their State to petition for redress of grievances. Their central grievance is their systematic and deliberate exclusion from voting, as is their right and, indeed, their duty as American citizens.

By order of Gov. George C. Wallace, an open champion of denying full citizen status to Negro Alabamians, the Selma marchers were told theirs was "an unlawful assembly" and ordered to disperse. When the marchers stood their ground, both on the soil of Alabama and on the constitutional guarantee of "the right of people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances," they were attacked. Between 30 and 40 victims required attention at hospitals for injuries up to and including possible skull fracture.

Americans everywhere indignantly condemn this abuse of the powers of public office. Rightly understood, the issue at Selma is one of justice versus unwarranted intimidation.

Justice is the concern for us all—of white Americans no less than of black Americans. What is to be deplored at Selma is the refusal of public officials, on purely racist grounds, to recognize millions of Americans as free, native-born citizens of the United States and of their home States.

Certainly with all the Federal law on the books, there should be ample authority for the Central Government to protect the constitutional rights of abused citizens. With court authority, it would be simple to interpose a protective phalanx of Federal marshals the next time the Alabama gestapo prepares another national disgrace.

#### SHAME AT SELMA

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, along with what I am sure is a great majority of Americans, I have been shocked and disgusted by the senseless and brutal beating of Negroes in Selma on Sunday. I have been dismayed by the flagrant disregard of civil rights and the total disrespect of simple human decency.

The shame perpetrated at Selma on Sunday should and must serve as a new and further call to action.

It should serve as a call on the Department of Justice to reconsider its basically "hands off" position in Selma and

elsewhere, where segregation is allowed to flourish and brutality continues to thrive.

It should serve as a call on this Congress to enact promptly new statutes that will guarantee full voting rights both in practice and in spirit.

It should serve as a call on us all to insure that the just and proper activities which have been enjoyed by most Americans for nearly two centuries are not denied to a few of our fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, in a brief but pointed editorial this morning, the New York Times has described the activities and meaning of "bloody Sunday." I commend it to all who are concerned with this critical problem of equal opportunity and basic constitutional rights:

#### INCIDENT AT SELMA

The "bloody Sunday" in Selma, Ala., brings the moral and legal issues in that State once again to a point of crisis.

The right of citizens to assemble peacefully and to petition their elected officials for redress of their grievances is as old as free government and as plain as the Declaration of Independence. The State of Alabama has the responsibility to protect its citizens, both Negro and white, in the exercise of that right.

Gov. George C. Wallace has instead chosen to meet peaceful protest with armed force. By authorizing State troopers, sheriff's deputies, and members of a volunteer posse to attack a group of private citizens, he has written another shameful page in his own record and in the history of Alabama.

The scene in Selma resembled that in a police state. Heavily armed men attacked the marchers. "The first 10 or 20 Negroes were swept to the ground screaming, arms and legs flying." Tear gas was used. "Fifteen or twenty nightsticks could be seen through the gas, flailing at the heads of the marchers." The hurried rout went on. "Four or five women lay on the grass strip where the troopers had knocked them down." Witnesses "said they saw possemen using whips on the fleeing Negroes as they recrossed the bridge."

If this is described as law enforcement, it is misnamed. It is nothing more nor less than race-conscious officialdom run amuck. It disgraces not only the State of Alabama but every citizen of the country in which it can happen.

#### DYNAMIC REA PROGRAM NECESSARY FOR A STRONG RURAL ECONOMY

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, over 8,500 rural electric co-op members from 46 States met at Miami Beach, Fla., January 25-28 for the 23d annual convention of their service organization, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. The resolutions adopted by these farm and rural leaders represent the thinking of the more than 20 million consumer-members of 975 rural electric systems across the Nation. These resolutions deserve our careful consideration.

I am very familiar with the worthwhile aims and achievements of the rural elec-

trification program, for it has contributed much to the socioeconomic health and well-being of the rural areas of my home State of Wisconsin. Before REA was created in 1935, only 19.6 percent of the farms in the State were receiving central station electricity. Today, 98.9 percent of the farms are electrified.

The 29 rural electric distribution cooperatives in Wisconsin provide electric service to 97,835 consumer-members over 32,045 miles of line. Nineteen of these co-ops have joined with cooperatives in Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois to generate and transmit their own supply of wholesale power through Dairyland Power Cooperative.

Mr. Speaker, the loan repayment record of Wisconsin's rural electric co-ops is a proud one. As of January 1, 1965, these REA borrowers had made a total of \$74,451,579 in payments on their Government loans of \$141,114,050. These payments include \$40,460,523 repaid on principal as due, \$9,901,208 of principal paid ahead of schedule, and \$24,089,848 in interest payments.

Because they serve in thinly populated rural areas, these cooperatives are handicapped by low consumer density and low revenue per mile. The rural electrics in Wisconsin serve only 3.2 consumers per mile and average \$538 in revenues per mile, as compared with 23.1 consumers and \$4,828 per mile for the commercial utilities. Despite these handicaps, the co-ops continue to move toward their goal of providing electric service to their consumer-members under rates and conditions comparable to those available in urban communities.

The availability of a dependable source of low-cost power is a vital factor in improving the social and economic condition of rural America. As we intensify our efforts to obtain parity of income and opportunity for our farmers and rural residents, it would indeed be penny wise, dollar foolish to hamstring the REA program through restrictive policies and inadequate funds.

Mr. Speaker, the rural electric cooperative leaders who attended NRECA's 1965 annual meeting have a working knowledge of the needs and potentials of the rural electrification program. Their resolutions reflect that knowledge. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the following resolutions dealing with REA loan funds and loan policies:

#### RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY DELEGATES TO NRECA'S 23d ANNUAL MEETING HELD JANUARY 25-28, 1965

##### RELEASE OF CONTINGENCY RESERVE LOAN FUND BY BUDGET BUREAU

Whereas the Congress authorized for fiscal year 1965 a total of \$365 million for REA electric loans, including a contingency reserve fund of \$90 million; and

Whereas our loan applications to REA this year require the entire \$365 million, as the NRECA annual loan survey showed would be the case and the NRECA legislative committee so testified to the House and the Senate Appropriations Committees last year: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge that the \$90 million contingency reserve fund be requested of the Bureau of the Budget by the REA Administrator and we urge the Bureau of the Budget to release the reserve funds for the

orderly and expeditious processing of our loan applications as the Congress intended.

#### REVOLVING LOAN FUND

*Resolved*, That we support legislation which will establish an REA loan account to be operated as a bona fide revolving fund, into which our loan repayments would be channeled for relending.

#### GENERATION AND TRANSMISSION LOANS

Whereas the ability of rural electric systems to fulfill their responsibilities is directly dependent on their ability to obtain dependable low-cost wholesale energy; and

Whereas in the face of dual rates, escalator clauses, and opposition from commercial power companies, the availability of G. & T. loans from REA is the only means many systems have to secure a dependable and adequate supply of low-cost energy; and

Whereas the rural electric systems now generate only 16 percent of their own energy needs, and less than 1 percent of all the energy generated in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we urge the President to recommend and the Congress of the United States to appropriate adequate REA loan funds to insure an effective G. & T. loan program to meet the needs of rural America for electric power.

#### SECTION 5 LOANS

Whereas the rural electric systems are vitally concerned with and are heavily engaged in efforts to renew the opportunities in rural America for providing a decent standard of living for a maximum number of rural people; and

Whereas the section 5 loans program is an effective means of helping in instances where no other help is available: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we support the principle that REA should continue to make section 5 loans which meet all legal and administrative requirements, when such loans are essential to and will make an effective contribution to economic and community development in rural electric service areas.

#### CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS STUDY AND REA LOAN TERMS

Whereas recognition has been given to the need for study in depth of future capital requirements of the rural electrification program; and

Whereas the 1964 annual meeting of NRECA requested that such study be initiated by NRECA and REA; and

Whereas in view of the technological advances that are taking place in the electric industry, the rural electric systems are certain to need tremendously increased quantities of capital under conditions that will give them the opportunity to provide rural service on a basis comparable with urban service: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That NRECA, in conjunction with its study now underway, make the examination sufficiently comprehensive to cover all major aspects of the financing problem including both public and private financing and the effects of varying loan terms on the ability of the systems to serve their basic purpose; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we urge that there be no modification of the REA loaning formula pending completion of the studies now in progress; be it

#### RURAL TELEPHONE LOAN AUTHORIZATION

*Resolved*, That we support the REA telephone loan authorization for fiscal year 1966, which will be requested by the National Telephone Cooperative Association.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

Whereas legislation was introduced in both Houses of the 88th Congress to amend the Administrative Procedure Act; and

Whereas some of the proposed changes in this law would impose the burden of public hearings on the REA Administrator in any rulemaking of general applicability and would open to judicial review all final decisions of the Administrator, thereby impairing the operation of the Rural Electrification Administration and the economic security of the rural electric program; and

Whereas rural electric loans do not directly and substantially affect the general public, but only the cooperatives themselves: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we oppose any change in the law which would open REA rulemaking procedures to public hearing; which would fail to continue the existing exemption for confidential information filed at REA; or which would open to judicial review decisions of the REA Administrator; and be it also

*Resolved*, That we oppose any attempt to burden the REA Administrator with unnecessary and expensive formal administrative proceedings, such as those proposed.

#### REA ADMINISTRATOR AND STAFF

Whereas REA Administrator Norman M. Clapp and the members of his staff have continuously and effectively made significant and meritorious contributions to the now-proven successful rural electrification effort in the United States, and have tirelessly worked with NRECA at all times, especially during the 10 regional meetings and this 23d annual meeting: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That for all of the members and consumers of members of NRECA, appreciation is expressed to these people for the work they have so successfully performed.

#### NRECA STAFF

*Resolved*, That this 23d annual meeting of members of NRECA hereby expresses appreciation to the general manager, Clyde T. Ellis, and all members of the staff of NRECA for their dedicated and tireless performance throughout the year, and also in the several meetings of members, for it is factual that without this total effort on the part of all members of the staff, NRECA could not have so successfully represented its member systems.

#### LARRY MEYER OF WISCONSIN

Whereas the Lord God Almighty in His infinite wisdom has decreed that Larry Meyer be taken from our midst; and

Whereas no single being has devoted more time, thought, or concern to the saving of the lives of rural electric cooperative line-men than did Larry Meyer in his duties as electric systems specialist with Employers Mutuals of Wausau; and

Whereas his passing means the loss of a great pioneer in the establishment of safe working practices for rural electric cooperative employees and of a great friend to the cause of safety: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the family of Larry Meyer and to Employers Mutuals of Wausau, as an expression of our heartfelt sympathy; and be it further

*Resolved*, That this great body assembled stand and devote a moment of silent prayer to honor the memory of this true friend and colleague.

#### HUMPHREY IN HARTFORD

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 6, 1965, at a testimonial dinner,

in Hartford, for the senior Senator from Connecticut, the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, Vice President HUMPHREY delivered one of the greatest speeches that it has been my privileges to hear.

Vice President HUMPHREY joined with a record crowd of friends of Tom Dodd and expressed his respect and warm affection for the guest of honor. At the same time, with characteristic eloquence, he set forth some of the policy objectives of our national Democratic administration. These have been expressed so effectively that I consider them worthy of circulation to a larger audience through inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, SENATOR DODD DINNER, MARCH 6, 1965

I am honored to be here this evening to pay tribute to my old friend and colleague, Tom Dodd. But any tribute I can render will surely be less than the one accorded Tom Dodd last November by the people of Connecticut.

His majority was the largest in the history of the State—the biggest landslide here by any candidate, any time.

Senator Dodd earned that majority by hard work—not only in the Senate, but also in his whole career of public service.

Senator Dodd spent an early part of his career as National Youth Administrator in Connecticut, under President Franklin Roosevelt. At that same time, a young public servant named Lyndon Johnson was doing the same important job in Texas.

Many years ago Tom Dodd was active in the battle for equal rights. He helped to create the Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice \* \* \* he served his country at the Nuremberg trials \* \* \* and he served two distinguished terms in the House of Representatives before coming to the U.S. Senate in 1958.

Tom Dodd has always fought hard for what he believes in. And he has forcefully represented the interests of the State of Connecticut and the Northeast. When he speaks, you know his voice is heard—and respected.

In the Senate, he has particularly distinguished himself in the fields of foreign relations, space, internal security, and juvenile delinquency.

Today Senator Dodd is in the front lines in attacking another great problem facing America: the problem of mass transportation in our urban areas.

Men like Tom Dodd are putting forth the efforts which will achieve the Great Society. Tonight, here in Connecticut, I want to talk to you about that Great Society. This is the right time and place to do so. You know here the pressing needs of our cities and of the need for better mass transit. You know how important it is that we maintain our heritage of natural beauty. You know the problems of the elder citizen who needs medical care. You know the problem that can least of all be postponed: the need for better educational facilities and better teaching. You know how unemployment and unequal opportunity can be a drag on the economy and on the human spirit alike.

The State of Connecticut and its representatives in the U.S. Congress have imaginatively and responsibly done things to keep pace with these problems. But there is no cause to let up on those efforts. There is great cause to try to do even more.

Let me discuss in greater detail the challenges we face and President Johnson's proposal to meet them.

Robert Herrick said in the 17th century that great cities seldom rest: if there be none to invade from afar, they will find worse foes at home. We know those foes today. They are slums, crime, a lack of playgrounds and

parks, overburdened schools, inadequate transportation, the crowding, the lack of clean air. And our cities are growing. Each year in the coming generation, we will add the equivalent of 15 cities the size of Hartford to our urban population.

You look for money to defeat these city foes and what do you find? You find our cities are earning far less than is needed to keep up with their debts. Why? Because a great share of our population growth is in children under 18 and adults over 65. This means that practically the same number of people in their working years have to care for almost double the number of dependents.

President Johnson proposed only this week a bold program for our cities, a program which would establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development; which would give financial assistance to cities that need it; which would aid public housing; which would combat crime. This program deserves your support.

You here in Connecticut and the Northeast are painfully aware of the needs for modern mass transportation. President Johnson has committed this administration to technical research and development of high-speed, intercity surface transport. He has suggested that we begin by demonstrating possible improvements in rail passenger services between Washington and Boston, in the northeast corridor.

As a first step, he has asked for \$20 million to be invested in research and development toward more modern and efficient means of moving people and goods. He has announced the Federal Government's willingness to assist those transportation systems, regions, and States which are willing to help themselves. This program deserves your support.

There is no more beautiful part of this country than western Connecticut and Massachusetts, than upstate New York. But this can be paradise lost. Clean water and air can be polluted. Automobile junkyards and billboards can crowd in on our highways. Our cities can lose their precious open space. Our landmarks can be destroyed.

In some parts of this country, these things are in the past tense. They have long since happened, and nature will be hard indeed to reclaim. This administration has a program to preserve our natural beauty. It deserves your support.

All of us in this country know too well the problems of aging. Our citizens are living longer. But are they living more happily? What family doesn't know the heartache—the long, empty days—that come to a man or woman who is aging, who is lonely, who is neglected? Prolonging life is not enough. We must prolong opportunity and usefulness; we must provide dignity.

The Johnson administration in 1964 gave unprecedented help to our senior Americans, both through legislative and Executive action. But we failed to pass the King-Anderson bill to provide necessary hospital care for the elderly. This administration is determined that 1965 will see passage of its medical care bill. This deserves your support—and don't be fooled by the massive campaign of newspaper, magazine, radio-television, and direct mail propaganda of the opponents of this program. They are fighting a losing battle in 1965.

Can we have a Great Society as long as millions of our people live in grinding poverty for lack of training; as long as jobs are denied for no good reason, but because of the color of a man's skin; as long as doors are closed to immigrants because of where they happened to be born; as long as some of our citizens are denied the right to vote? The Johnson administration has made proposals in 1965 which will move toward righting these wrongs. These proposals, too, deserve your support.

They reach to our hearts. Do we believe that men are created equal? Do we immi-

grants—and all of us are immigrants or sons of immigrants—do we still offer welcome to those who would come to America to build a better life?

There is education. The story of education is the story of this country. No people in the world believe in broad excellence in education as we do. Education is our only guarantee of security in the world, of welfare at home. From the time our Nation was founded until 1930, only 1 million students had enrolled in American colleges. Now we enroll a million every 2 years. But even so, some of our finest young minds are not getting to college. This is a waste of a vital natural resource. Then there is the tragedy of noneducation. We spend about \$450 a year per pupil in our public schools. But we spend \$1,800 a year to keep a delinquent in a detention home, \$2,500 a year for a family on relief, and \$3,500 a year for an inmate in a State prison.

Our schools are crowded. We need more and better teachers. President Johnson has proposed ambitious measures which can strengthen and maintain American education at all levels. This program certainly deserves your support.

These are some of the things here at home which will be accomplished only if you join in the battle, if you share in the vision of a Great Society.

I would be negligent here tonight if I did not also ask for your support for something else: for the belief that the world need not destroy itself by war, and that we Americans can help others, too, find a better society.

We hear many voices these days saying that America is overextended in the world \* \* \* that other people's problems need not be our problems \* \* \* that we ought to close up shop overseas and enjoy our fruits here in the good old USA.

My friends, when that time comes, this Nation is doomed. Who in the world will work for democracy if we do not? Who in the world can preserve the peace if we do not? Who in the world can set the example, can offer the needed hand, if we do not?

We live in a time when everything is complex, when there are no more rapid or easy answers. We live in a time when we must exert our patience as never before. Have we the patience, for instance, to work and bleed 5,000 miles from home for months and years ahead—without any guarantee of final success? I can tell you that the forces of totalitarianism have that patience.

This is what the Great Society is all about. It is the recognition that a second car and power mowers and dry martinis are not enough. It is the recognition that we stand for something not seen before in the world. We stand for the dignity and fulfillment of individual man and woman. We stand for the chance for each man to make something better of himself. We stand for free speech and government of the people. We stand for peace without conquest. We stand for the belief that others, too, in less fortunate places should have opportunity for the blessings of abundance and should be free of tyranny. We stand for the pledges made by men and women who left the old ways and fought a living out of the soil of a new continent.

President Johnson has made his commitment to all of us. I join him in that commitment. We ask your help.

#### REPUBLICAN NEWS RELEASE ON VOTES CONCERNING HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 1, the Republican congressional committee attempted to interject an element of viciousness into the political life of the First District of Iowa that is unparalleled in the political history of the region. The people of Iowa are an intelligent and thoughtful citizenry. Throughout the history of our region they have forthrightly rejected extremism whether of the left or the right. They above all resent chicanery and distortion of the facts.

When they know the facts, I am sure they will resent, as I resent, the savage attack that was made upon me because of my vote concerning the House Un-American Activities Committee. In an unprecedented news release which was printed in several Iowa newspapers on March 1, the Republican congressional committee stated that by my vote to withhold funds from the House Un-American Activities Committee, I "had lined myself up with every subversive organization in the country which is trying to abolish the committee."

In support of this smear attack the Republican congressional committee presented a distorted account of the transactions on that day. I would like to correct their distorted account with documented account of developments as they actually occurred so that all can see for themselves what had taken place. Unlike many in recent history who have cringed under smear attacks of this type, I feel it is absolutely necessary to bring such attacks into full public view so the people not only in my district but the Nation as a whole may judge for themselves.

#### ITEM I: ORIGIN OF OPEN HEARINGS PROPOSAL

First. This Republican congressional committee attack completely omits any reference to the origin of the request for open hearings on the budget of the House Un-American Activities Committee. In point of fact, a distinguished Republican, Congressman CURTIS of Missouri, on February 8, 1965, originated the suggestion stating:

It would be helpful if the House Administration Committee would hold public hearings at the time the budget of the House Un-American Activities is under consideration and invite the critics of the House Un-American Activities Committee to be heard in full.

Second. Upon hearing Congressman CURTIS' suggestions of February 8, it was my thought, in view of the long-standing controversy over the House Un-American Activities Committee, that full open public hearings represented the most sensible approach to the problem. In past years critics of the committee had merely attempted to abolish the committee. In my estimation a sensible and thoughtful series of open hearings represent a much more intelligent approach.

#### ITEM II: WHY OPEN HEARINGS?

First. Why should the budget of the House Un-American Activities Committee be the subject of public discussion in open hearings?

Second. A thorough discussion of the funds of this committee was absolutely necessary, in my estimation, because of serious inequalities that exist in the allotment of committee funds. The Republican congressional committee's charge against me failed to mention that the entire House did indeed on the same day support a reduction in the funds allotted to this committee. The total budget for the committee of \$370,000 was unusually large because there are only 9 members on the House Un-American Activities Committee but they presently have 57 staff members on the average doing their job. In contrast, the Interior Committee with 34 members has only 10 staff members to assist it. Last session Congress appropriated over \$851,000 to the House Un-American Activities Committee to finance the work of that committee. Only one piece of legislation was produced by the House Un-American Activities Committee on the basis of this appropriation. In contrast, the Committee on Interior received \$271,000 to consider 859 bills of which 143 became law.

#### ITEM III: FACTUAL DISTORTIONS

First. The vicious attack made upon me by the Republican congressional committee stated that I did not realize "the importance of having a committee of Congress with powers to investigate subversive activities, whether they come from the far left or the far right."

Second. This is a deliberate attempt to distort exactly what happened. In point of fact, on February 25 two votes were taken concerning the House Un-American Activities Committee. The first of these votes was on a motion to instruct the Committee on House Administration to hold open hearings on the justification for the funds for the House Un-American Activities Committee. This motion was defeated by a vote of 332 to 58. I voted with the minority for open hearings for the reasons that I discussed above under item II.

Third. After the defeat of the motion for open hearings, a second vote was taken on the proposal to continue the committee through the 89th session of Congress. This motion was passed by a vote of 359 to 29. I voted with the majority to continue the committee. It is obvious again that the Republican congressional committee has deliberately tried to distort the action of February 25 by conveniently omitting any reference to this second rollcall vote. The Republican congressional committee has also tried to insinuate that I oppose having a committee with powers to investigate subversive activities. Contrary to this insidious allegation, I have always realized the necessity for having such an investigatory body but have been disturbed over the years because there was often an unwillingness on the part of the committee to pursue vigorously investigation of the far right. I have been very heartened by the suggestion of a new member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, Congressman WELTNER of Georgia, recommending a thorough investigation of the Ku Klux Klan.

I find this smear particularly offensive because it is an attempt to destroy public confidence by a most insidious and delib-

erate method. If the nameless speechwriters who lurked behind the title of the Republican congressional committee would step forward, I would invite them to compare whatever record they have to mine. I want them to know that I did not serve with the U.S. Navy in World War II for 4½ years in order to be intimidated by smear attacks by individuals afraid to even put their names on their news releases. I feel that my own public service as that of my father before me who served in the American Expeditionary in France and those forefathers who served as citizens and soldiers in Europe's first democracy, Switzerland, speaks for itself. I shall never hesitate to take a stand on matters that concern the most sacred of our constitutional rights. The attack upon me by the Republican congressional committee ended with the statement that my vote was "highly indicative of the type of Congressman now representing this district." I think the people of my district are intelligent enough to know that this attack upon me is highly indicative of the type of leadership that prevails in the Republican congressional committee and that this type of attack is shameful and an insult to the intelligence of the people of our communities.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have seen a copy of the news release. It involves the old technique of trying to convict people by innuendo and association. Though I did not agree with the gentleman on his vote, this "big lie" technique has not paid off at the American polls.

#### THE LATE LEO LERNER

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce the sudden and untimely passing of one of Chicago's great citizens and one of my very dear friends, Leo A. Lerner. His death in Chicago last Sunday took from our midst one of the most talented, perceptive, courageous, and dedicated journalists and civic leaders of our time.

When he was a young boy, Leo Lerner attended a party where the hostess handed out slips of paper for her guests to write their ideas of what every young person ought to work for. His inscription was, "The Advancement of Civilization."

At a later time in his life, when he was frustrated by stumbling blocks he encountered en route to that youthful goal, he once described himself as a "pygmy sent to move a mountain." But he never lost sight of that early vision, and the remarkable attainments of his 58 years testify to his ambition.

Officially Mr. Lerner presided over a chain of 20 newspapers that comprise the

largest group of community newspapers in the United States. He was president of the Lincoln-Belmont Publishing Co., the Neighborhood Press, Myers Publishing Co., and editor and publisher of Myers newspapers, Booster publications, and Times Home newspapers. Although he was an outstanding executive he never lost his zest for reporting and feature writing.

I believe he would prefer to be remembered among the legions of "the untamed shrews and shrieks of the wonderful era of reading and writing," as he once described columnists.

Mr. Lerner—

Said Carl Sandburg—

was Diogenes without a lantern and satisfied that Diogenes might have done better with a telephone. We have seen him imitate Montaigne in being ready to publish things troubling his mind, asking questions he has no answer to. We have seen him trying to follow St. Paul in holding fast to what is good and true, shamelessly admitting that the going is not so good and true.

The poet continued:

He knows it is good luck and a privilege to write a column and print it in a paper he himself owns. He knows too it is a trust and a responsibility he ought never violate or betray. This isn't easy. So he never hesitates at getting a chuckle or laugh out of the grotesques and monkeyshines of the endless human procession.

For more than a generation, Mr. Lerner was "the neighborhood editor of Chicago." His uninhibited editorship and his "First Column" gained him the affectionate title of "The Country Editor in the City."

He was, in his own talented and unorthodox way, the William Allen White of Chicago's North Side neighborhoods. He never locked himself into an editorial cocoon and he never cast himself in the role of a commentator who knows all the answers.

There was with him always the human touch, the humility and the understanding that the true writer and editor brings to his audience. By injecting his personality and his opinions into print, Mr. Lerner did much to recapture for us the rich flavor of well-reasoned personal journalism.

Though his arena was primarily in the columns of local, community newspapers, he relished the universal. He journeyed often to far corners of the world, and he brought that world closer to his public through his witty, pungent, and descriptive columns. His "First Column" roamed the globe, and many of these items found their way into the books he published. Only recently he completed a travel book on Hawaii, and his final volume, "The Truth Ripens," was completed just before his untimely death.

There was nothing provincial in the man or in his art. He was born September 20, 1907, one of 10 children of an immigrant merchant tailor from Austria. His home was in a slum area on Chicago's South Side. Mr. Lerner soon displayed his aptitude for the printed word. He edited the Crane High School Chronicle and was a night editor for the Northwestern University Daily.

In his second year at the university, he worked as a reporter for the Niles Center News, a community paper published in Skokie, Ill. Then, while still a student, he progressed to the part-time management of two other journals. He then borrowed \$500 to buy a small shop in the Lake View community, which became the Lincoln-Belmont Booster. He was on his way, and he was not to be denied. Soon he was at the helm of three other North Side neighborhood newspapers. He said:

Anything that writes and anything that can be written on is fair game for me. I have used old letters, paper and cloth napkins, orange wrappers, paper towels, old invoices, paper bags, composition books, the foldout page in Playboy, and the backs of laundry lists.

He knew the tools of his craft, and he knew his own mind, and he knew how to make them work together. He wrote:

There is no freedom for any man, not one, if there is no freedom for the press. That's why there are so many old decrepit typewriters. The typewriter and the mimeograph machine and the little handfed press are the really great symbols of liberty.

Further, he said:

The future offers hope to those who have faith. The faith comes from our knowledge that the people can rule themselves if they want to; that if we are not afraid of ideas we can use them to better our conditions, to have peace, security, and liberty.

Individualism was one side of Mr. Lerner. But he was never one to let the hot type of his editorials cool off. Instead, he plunged into the activist role through innumerable community chores.

His involvement began when, as a cub reporter, he helped organize a community library in the suburb where he was working. Always an adventurer in the world of ideas, Mr. Lerner was from 1936 to 1944 a director of the Chicago Public Library. As a pioneer in education, he joined others in the establishment of Roosevelt University, the urban school that now has more than 7,000 students. He was president of the university's board of trustees for a decade—from 1950 to 1960.

Mr. Lerner was president of the Cancer Prevention Center of Chicago. He served as a member of the Illinois Parole and Pardon Board. He was a YMCA director. In politics, he was chairman of the Independent Voters of Illinois for 4 years, a former national treasurer of the Americans for Democratic Action and a cochairman of the National Stevenson for President Committee in 1952.

Last year President Lyndon B. Johnson appointed him to serve on the advisory board of the Community Relations Services.

Somebody once asked him how he decided on which civic responsibilities he would accept and he replied, characteristically, "I don't know, unless it's that I take up those causes opposed by the Devil himself."

His contributions were officially recognized in 1961 when Mayor Richard J. Daley awarded him the Chicago Medal of Merit.

As a newspaperman, he won the Herick Award for Democracy in Journalism

from the National Editorial Association and was cited for the best editorial submitted in competition to the Illinois Press Association in 1937.

For his readers, Mr. Lerner explored a world far beyond the confines of one man's view. His numerous travels spoke of government, of art, of nature—but mostly of other people. Among the seasons, he was forever writing about the spring, and he drew strength, joy, and writing material from his modest farming efforts at his beloved Kettle Moraine Farm in Wisconsin. His writings breathed of freshness and adventure and of new discovery.

Carl Sandburg, noting these wide interests, said that as "an editor, a traveler, a naturalist, a lover of children and trees, at home with big city slickers and smalltime do-gooders, both metropolitan and country boy, Leo Lerner seems to be one of those rich Americans whose chief possessions no turn of fate can take away."

For the world, Leo Lerner envisioned "a day when power will come from wisdom and goodness, and not from avarice and material success." For himself, he said, simply and earnestly, that "there is no such thing as an unbeautiful day."

For his family, his friends, and his readers, the world in these moments of mourning seems much smaller with his passing. But he enlarged that world for us, and it is a better place because of him.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, when word reached me of the passing of Leo A. Lerner, newspaper editor-publisher and civic leader in Chicago, I was greatly saddened by the news. He succumbed to a heart attack in the prime of his life.

Leo A. Lerner was truly one of the pioneers of Chicago's rapid growth in stature as a modern, major city in the world. His voice and ideas reached out to the community through his excellent writings, both as a newspaperman and author. But his ideas were not just words, for he took an active part in civic affairs by devoting a goodly portion of his spare time in voluntary work for the improvement of the community.

His interest in the field of journalism began in his high school days and became his livelihood following his college days. He was a success in his field for he embarked on a fresh, new approach in reporting. He did not become embroiled in the broad spectrum of journalism as practiced by the daily papers, but he appealed to communities of the north, North West Side of Chicago. He reported the interesting news events that occurred in the neighborhoods that were being ignored by the daily publications. His programing of weekly publications was well received by his many readers, for there were many stories of familiar names and places. As a crusader for neighborhood improvements, Leo Lerner would listen to the needs of his neighbors and worked to bring about the changes that made for better living conditions.

As he achieved success in his business he increased his participation in civic affairs. He was director of the Chicago Public Library from 1943 to 1947; served

as president of Roosevelt University board of trustees from 1950 to 1960 and later as president of the Cancer Prevention Center of Chicago.

In 1962 he was appointed by Gov. Otto Kerner to the Illinois Parole and Pardon Board and served that year.

Although a modest man not seeking personal glory, his dedication to helping his fellow man did not go unnoticed. In 1964 he was awarded the Chicago Medal of Merit by Mayor Richard J. Daley. That same year President Johnson appointed Leo A. Lerner to the citizens advisory board of the Community Relations Services.

It is hard to comprehend that a man so active was called to his Maker, for he could have made many more valuable contributions toward humanity. We cannot question this judgment, but we should be grateful that Leo Lerner lived to contribute his unselfish devotion for the good of his neighbors. He will be sorely missed but we, in Chicago, will cherish his memory and all that he stood for.

My heartfelt sympathy and sincerest condolences go out to his family in their time of grief.

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Speaker, as were my fellow colleagues from Chicago and the State of Illinois, I was very saddened to learn of the death of Leo Lerner, editor, and publisher of the Lerner Home newspapers of Chicago.

Leo Lerner was one of our foremost editors and publishers, but his reputation as a civic leader was even more outstanding. He gave of himself fully in such diverse but productive positions as director of the Chicago Public Library, president of Roosevelt University board of trustees, president of Cancer Prevention Center of Chicago, and most recently, as appointee of Gov. Otto Kerner, member of the Illinois Parole and Pardon Board.

For these and other contributions he was honored by the city of Chicago this past year when Mayor Richard J. Daley awarded him the Chicago Medal of Merit. In 1964 he also was appointed by President Johnson to the Citizens Advisory Board of the Community Relations Service.

Mr. Speaker, what is perhaps even more remarkable about this man is that while so deeply engaged in so many community projects and overseeing the operations of his 21 community newspapers, he still found the time to write a most thought-provoking and reflective column in every edition of his newspapers. Entitled "The First Column," these articles ranged over every conceivable subject of interest and concern to his readers. He was equally at home writing of ward and precinct politics as he was in discussing international affairs and problems. He could philosophize about the nature of man or detail, in homey expressions, the trials and tribulations of a favorite grandchild.

Such men are not found in great number, and I am sure his family's loss will be shared by many others who knew him and were his friends.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of

the House who desire to do so have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States each year conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. The winning contestant from each State is brought here to our Nation's Capital for the final judging.

Mr. Speaker, this year, the winning contestant from the State of Wisconsin is also from my congressional district. She is Miss Mary A. McCarrier of Wausau, Wis., and the title of her winning speech is "The Challenge of Citizenship."

In the contest this year, Mr. Speaker, over 250,000 high school students participated from all over the country for the four scholarships which will be awarded as top prizes. First prize is a \$5,000 scholarship, second prize is \$3,500, third prize is \$2,500, and the fourth is \$1,500.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Miss Mary A. McCarrier's winning speech entitled "The Challenge of Citizenship."

#### THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Mary A. McCarrier)

I look at my sister Eileen asleep in her crib, so fragile, so trusting, and can't help but wonder what kind of a world this will be when she is 17. Will it be the "big brother" state of 1984, or a productive democracy free from hatred and prejudice?

All I know is that I'll do my share, and more if need be, to make hers a bright future, full of justice and hope. I feel it's my responsibility to her; and it's your responsibility too. If not for Eileen, for someone else—your brother, your sister, your son, your daughter. Do your part to make this land worthy of its heritage, worthy of its future citizens, worthy of the men who died at Concord and Yorktown, at Vicksburg and Shiloh, in Europe and the Pacific. Make it worthy of the man who gave his life in Dallas doing more than his share. Make this land worthy of your pride.

You are one man. You are a powerful man. You are a beginning. And there shall be other men alone in their beliefs, men who will follow your beginning. Ultimately you will unite, and a great movement will grow and flourish until it develops a new America, a just America, the America our forefathers dreamed of and fought for. It will be a struggle, as it always has been, but you have a cause worth fighting for. There will be obstacles, and the fiercest of these is widespread in our Nation today. It is what makes citizenship a challenge. It is the parasite that drains man of his courage and integrity. It is indifference.

Indifference is the big word that means so many little things. It's the, "Oh, it doesn't really matter," or the, "What difference does

one man make?" This attitude of apathy that regards even the important things as indifferent matter—voting, personal rights, patriotism. Ruining our perspective, it makes everything gray, neither black nor white, neither really bad nor truly good. Few things have importance, and you don't even make much difference.

You can see it today when our citizens are embarrassed to place their hands over their hearts when our flag passes, and when people talk while our national anthem is being played. It is appearing in our young people too, to whom the Pledge of Allegiance is just a meaningless group of words—words that don't make sense.

Indifference is the web that ensnares even some of our most loyal citizens, and allows a mob of gangsters to rule practically every phase of city and State governments in some areas. It makes us forget to ask if this is the land of the free and the home of the brave, or the land of prejudiced and the home of the crooked politician.

You are one man. You are a powerful man. You are the hope of America. Please, for all of us, accept the challenge of citizenship. Eileen and I have too little power now, for our time is yet to come. Please start to combat and destroy this venomous indifference, struggle for the cause of freedom and democracy. Help in the fight for justice and equality, but do more than that, man of America. Do much more. Hold your head high and glow with pride and realize what an honor, a privilege and a challenge is citizenship in the greatest nation in the world. Make yourself worthy.

#### STUDY OF FUTURE HIGHWAY NEEDS

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive study of certain future highway needs. The bill would authorize the Secretary to make a comprehensive study of the needs of the Federal-Aid Highway Systems, including the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, after 1972. The study shall be made in cooperation with State highway departments and shall include but not be limited to costs, possible extensions of such Interstate System, and such other considerations as the Secretary may deem advisable. The Secretary shall submit a report of his findings to Congress not later than January 1, 1967.

The House passed a bill, H.R. 8853, on December 19, 1963, to authorize the Secretary to make a comprehensive study of certain future highway needs after 1972 and to submit a report thereon to the Congress. Unfortunately, this bill was not acted upon by the Senate. In the meantime, however, the Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway departments are proceeding to undertake the study contemplated by that bill.

Mr. Speaker, a study of this nature is vital for the continued success of the Federal-aid highway program and the development of a comprehensive high-

way program after 1972. The need to plan and prepare now to meet the continuing nationwide requirements for additional and improved highway facilities becomes apparent when we look at the highway legislation already being enacted by the Congress. I have particular reference to the Appalachian Regional Development Act which Congress has just enacted. The Appalachian Act establishes a discriminatory 2,350-mile development highway system and 1,000 miles of local access roads in the region. The concept behind this highway section of the Appalachian Act is contrary to every sound concept on the Nation's highway program.

Mr. Speaker, a comprehensive study of this Nation's future highway needs is vital to protect the Federal Government's investment in the program and to protect the Nation's highway users from a slow-down or an improperly directed future highway program.

I sincerely hope that the Committee on Public Works, the committee which has jurisdiction over this matter and the committee on which I have served since I came to Congress, will give this bill and similar bills prompt consideration.

#### CLEVELAND URGES FAIR TAX TREATMENT FOR OWNERS OF MUTUAL FUND SHARES

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 5921, in an effort to correct an inequity in the laws interpreting the value of mutual fund shares, which are quoted over the counter. As you know, prices quoted in the papers for these shares include a "bid" price and an "asked" price. Naturally, the "asked" price is always higher than the "bid" price. A shareholder who sells his holdings never gets the "asked" price. But, under present laws, when he dies or makes a gift of these shares, the Internal Revenue Service uses the "asked" price as the basis for its valuation and tax computation. The shareholder or his estate is thus taxed on property which he, in fact, does not possess. He cannot get the "asked" price the IRS uses and he is overtaxed, as a result, in proportion to the difference between the two prices. This is grossly unfair and H.R. 5921 would require that, for purposes of estate and gift taxes, the "bid" price be used. This will furnish the true value of the holdings and eliminate the unjust extra bonus, which now must be paid to the Government.

#### CLEVELAND AMORY JOINS CAMPAIGN FOR HUMANE TREATMENT OF LABORATORY ANIMALS

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, I introduced H.R. 5647, a bill to set reasonable standards of humane care for animals used in scientific research and experimental laboratories.

Soon after the introduction of H.R. 5647, my attention was called to an article in the New York Sunday Times of February 7 describing the work of Mr. Cleveland Amory, the author, along the same lines. Mr. Amory, a native of New Hampshire, has established the first office in New York City of the Humane Society of the United States, at 140 West 57th Street. I commend this progressive step and point out that the purpose of Mr. Amory's work is identical to the intent of my bill, which is described on page 3980 of the RECORD of March 2. This legislation would in no way inhibit the progress of legitimate scientific research nor the use of animals for experiments by qualified persons. This bill, however, would eliminate much duplication of work, causing needless pain to thousands of vertebrate animals, and would require only that experimental animals be cared for and treated humanely.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that we will all feel better when this legislation is on the books and I am equally certain that science itself will benefit from the improved condition of the animals used for experiments.

I offer the Times article on Mr. Amory for the RECORD in the hope that every Member will read it with approbation:

AMORY RECRUITS ANIMALS' FRIENDS—AUTHOR OPPOSES NEEDLESS VIVISECTION CRUELTY

(By John C. Devlin)

When Cleveland Amory attended his first formal dinner party and dance in a Boston suburb as a Milton Academy teenager, he not only took a pretty girl but also a pet raccoon.

This, as he tells it today, did not go over well with the young lady and the romance ended. However, Mr. Amory's interest in animals and their welfare has grown through the years.

Now Mr. Amory—whose books include "The Proper Bostonians" and "What Happened to Society?"—is opening the city's first office for the Humane Society of the United States, at 140 West 57th Street. The author is a member of the national board of directors.

At an interview over cheese blintzes and a glass of tea at the Russian Tea Room, Mr. Amory said he was not opposed to vivisection.

"What I object to," he said "is needless duplication by various laboratories of experiments on animals, in uncomfortable and oftentimes cruel quarters and such things as high school students performing experiments on living animals."

#### AGAINST NEEDLESS CRUELTY

The author, a former newspaperman in Nashua, N.H., and Tucson, Ariz., and a columnist for the Saturday Review (among others), is a big, tousle-haired man. He does not smoke, take a cocktail with luncheon, or a back seat in conversation.

"I want to emphasize that I am not opposed to the scientific use of animals for the benefit of man," he said. "What I am op-

posed to is man's needless cruelty to these animals."

He has had a running feud on the subject with Dr. Morris Fishbein, former editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association.

Mr. Amory said that at Harvard University scientists forced dogs to inhale flames and then did not kill them for 3 or 5 days afterward. He added high school students in Dallas had been performing "survival surgery" on live dogs.

A spokesman at the Harvard Medical School confirmed that dogs had been made to inhale flames as part of an experiment for the Army during World War II to determine exact effects of flame throwers.

#### SUPPORT CITED

He said, however, that although the dogs were permitted to live 3 to 5 days, they were anesthetized to save them from pain. He said the public was permitted to visit the laboratories and that Mr. Amory had been invited but apparently did not accept.

Mr. Amory quoted Miss Helen Jones of the National Catholic Society for Animal Welfare, as supporting his position by saying that in "respected laboratories animals are truly beaten, starved, burned, frozen, blinded, drowned, forced to swim till they die, deprived of sleep, irradiated, skinned, and subjected to other methods of inducing pain and fear in infinite variety."

Mr. Amory will start a campaign here for membership in his organization.

#### CLEVELAND RENEWS DRIVE TO WIN COLLEGE TUITION TAX RELIEF

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a duplicate of my bill from the last Congress to grant needed tax relief to those who must bear the heavy and growing costs of obtaining a college education.

This legislation is described in the following press releases, which I submit for the RECORD under unanimous consent:

Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire, today reintroduced his bill to grant tax relief for the costs of higher education.

The Cleveland bill would grant an annual tax credit of 20 percent of the total amount paid by an individual in tuition, laboratory, library, and field-study fees as well as 20 percent of the cost of required textbooks. Individuals could claim the credit for their own educational expenses or for those of their children, spouses, parents, parents of spouses, or any legal dependents.

Congressman CLEVELAND said: "This legislation is in direct response to the pressing needs of millions of citizens to whom the soaring costs of college education are a burden they cannot afford. My bill provides one of the best possible ways to furnish Federal aid to education by relieving the pressure where it hurts the most. A college degree is almost a necessity in today's society. The whole future of the country depends on the trained brains of the people. Our Government, whose reckless fiscal policies are principally responsible for inflation and the rising costs of living, owes an obligation to the country to ease the taxload on those who have to pay these climbing costs so that

our young people can receive the training they need—and the country needs.

"There is mounting pressure from the American people for this legislation, and I shall do everything I can to insure that Congress, which has always rejected the idea in past years, responds to the need this time."

#### CLEVELAND INTRODUCES REPUBLICAN VOTING-RIGHTS BILL

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that I have joined some of my Republican colleagues in the introduction of new legislation to strengthen Federal law to protect the right to vote. My bill is H.R. 5920 and I offer the press release I issued on it for the RECORD:

Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire, has joined a group of fellow Republicans in introducing a comprehensive voting-rights bill to strengthen legislation first adopted under the Eisenhower administration.

"I had hoped that passage of the Civil Rights Act last year, with its implicit message of national outrage against discrimination, would be sufficient to bring local election officials and others to their senses," Congressman CLEVELAND said. "Events in Selma, Ala., and elsewhere, have destroyed these hopes. Evidently the message has not gotten across and there remain continuing violations of the constitutional rights of large numbers of citizens. This legislation is intended to guarantee these rights."

"Under the 1960 law," he continued, "the Attorney General may apply to a U.S. court for a finding of a pattern or practice of denying citizens the right to vote on unconstitutional grounds of racial discrimination. Should the court find such a pattern, it is authorized to enroll the aggrieved citizens as voters, but these procedures have proven ineffective and little used."

"It is clear now that more is needed," he said, "There are many areas where no Negroes at all are registered to vote and recent experience has shown that the existing law is not sufficient to guarantee the right to vote to everyone who is qualified. The Republican Party is committed to equality of opportunity and individual freedom for everyone. More than that, these are national commitments reaching far beyond the boundaries of partisan politics."

"This bill, fulfilling my party's commitment, would require a court to take a position in such cases," Congressman CLEVELAND said. "It would establish that where a court finds that 50 or more otherwise qualified citizens in a voting district are being denied the right to vote, it must report a finding of illegal discrimination and appoint registrars to enroll victims of this discrimination. If, within 40 days, the court should fail to comply, the President is directed to appoint registrars himself. This provision would make impossible the endless delays and legalistic maneuvering that currently are blocking action in these cases."

"This bill incorporates proposals first advocated by former Attorney General Herbert Brownell in 1957 but which were not adopted by the Congress. It will carry out the Federal responsibility to insure that all citizens have equal rights before the law."

### EMBASSIES SELL U.S.-OWNED POUNDS

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the tourist-dollar exchange program which I initiated in 1961 as an amendment to Public Law 480 is finally getting some attention.

Under this program U.S. citizens traveling abroad can exchange dollars for U.S.-owned local currency. Potentially, it could be a multi-million-dollar assist in our balance-of-payments problem.

Due to neglect and foot dragging by the administration, it has been put into operation in only 2 countries—although 28 other countries have agreed to cooperate.

In view of the critical nature of our balance-of-payments problem, this neglect is almost incredible.

However, it was gratifying to note an article in the Sunday Washington Post, as follows:

UNDER TREASURY PRESSURE: U.S. EMBASSIES PEDDLE POUNDS

(By Harvey H. Segal)

Balance-of-payments pressures have cast the Government in the somewhat uncomfortable role of trying to sell Egyptian and Israeli pounds to Americans who visit Cairo and Tel Aviv.

For nearly 2 years, tourists bound for Egypt have been handed a small pink slip announcing that Egyptian pounds are for sale at the U.S. Embassy in Cairo. Travelers to Israel receive an almost identically phrased green slip.

Officials at the Treasury, which initiated the sales, explain that they are an effort to utilize surpluses of local currencies arising out of the food-for-peace or Public Law 480 programs.

Under Public Law 480, surplus agricultural commodities are sold to needy countries for local currencies. Local currency balances are then drawn upon by Embassies and other U.S. agencies to cover their operating expenses.

#### HUGE SURPLUSES BUILT

But surpluses far in excess of what the Government can possibly spend—about \$700 million—have accumulated in a handful of countries, notably India, Pakistan, Burma, Yugoslavia, Poland, Israel, and Egypt.

When American tourists buy foreign currencies through regular channels, the dollars they use to do it are likely to fall into the hands of the local central banking authorities. And dollars in the hands of foreign central banks can be used to buy gold from the U.S. Treasury. A potential gold drain is averted when tourist purchases are made from the Public Law 480 balances.

Of the countries with substantial American tourist businesses that were approached, only Egypt and Israel permit the United States to sell their currencies.

Permission was granted with an obvious reluctance. Both countries have their own balance-of-payments problems and need all the dollars that they can earn. Moreover, by selling from the Public Law 480 balances, the U.S. Embassies compete with local currency traders.

In view of these delicate problems, the Treasury and the U.S. Embassies have adopted a discreet soft-sell approach. Sales are made only at U.S. Embassies and during their working hours. Promotion has been confined to the two typewritten notices.

#### SMALL RESPONSE

The response has been correspondingly small. Since the beginning of 1963 some 130,000 American tourists have visited Egypt and spent about \$19 million there. But sales of Egyptian pounds through the U.S. Embassy in Cairo have amounted only to \$77,000.

In Israel, sales of pounds by the Embassy in Tel Aviv have amounted to \$11,000 since January, 1964. Yet in the same period nearly 83,000 American tourists spent some \$20 million there.

An attempt is now being made to extend the currency sales program to India, but in view of the disappointing results in Egypt and Israel and their inability to mount a more vigorous sales campaign, some Government officials are asking whether it is really worth the effort.

### WORLD'S BIGGEST BOONDOGGLE

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I trust that the editorial, "World's Biggest Boondoggle," appearing in yesterday's New York Times, will be perused carefully by the task force recently appointed to analyze the field-level report on aspects of the proposed Rampart Dam project on the Yukon River in Alaska. I ask that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD, for it refers to what would be North America's most northerly, most extravagant, and most absurd hydroelectric project:

#### WORLD'S BIGGEST BOONDOGGLE

Fascination with bigness is said to be an American trait and no doubt there is some truth in the comment. There is danger that the sheer size of the proposed Rampart Dam on the Yukon River may so overawe Federal engineers and some Members of Congress that they will fail to insist on answers to questions that must be answered before more than a billion dollars are poured into this remote Alaskan project.

Even if it would create an impoundment larger than Lake Erie and surpass in size any hydroelectric project yet undertaken by the Soviet Union, will it benefit the United States if it turns out also to be the world's biggest sinkhole for public funds?

The real deterrents to industrial development in the most northerly State are the high costs of labor and transportation, distance from markets, and climate. These disadvantages are so disproportionately great that a margin of 1 or 2 mills per kilowatt-hour in power costs is not going to determine the ability of any industrial operation to succeed in Alaska.

The cheapness of Rampart power, a favorite talking point of the proponents, depends upon full utilization of the potential output. Adding the cost of transmission over so great a distance, could the surplus really be delivered at a competitive price in Washington and Oregon? Could it compete with nuclear generators or with the new technology of mine-mouth, coal-burning powerplants

close to the markets? And even if it could, is the damage Rampart would do worth it?

The Rampart impoundment would destroy irreplaceable wildlife resources. It would inundate vast marshes that now add more than 1½ million ducks, geese, and cranes annually to continental wildlife flights. It would wipe out habitat which, according to the Fish and Wildlife Service, now produces 3½ million fur-bearing animals and large numbers of other game. The high dam would cut Yukon River salmon production drastically, perhaps in half.

There are other favorable hydroelectric sites in Alaska which, although smaller, would be closer to the coastal cities where industrial growth is most likely to occur, and which would do far less damage to natural resources.

Secretary of the Interior Udall has appointed a six-man task force to analyze the department's voluminous field report on the colossal project. Release of the latter report recently set off some premature cheering by Senator ERNEST GRUENING and other proponents; but Mr. Udall has made it clear that his department has not endorsed the plan. The findings of his task force will be awaited with great interest. So will a separate analysis now being made by the School of Natural Resources of the University of Michigan under the auspices of the Natural Resources Council.

The Rampart project was announced from Anchorage in mid-September 1963, under what could have been the spell of the aurora borealis, which is seen most frequently at the time of the equinox and is supposedly of electrical origin. Estimated cost of Rampart was set at \$1,200 million for the 5 million kilowatt project.

What it would cost at today's inflated values is not immediately available, but I can at this time offer comparable figures on steam-electric plants that could provide the same volume of power at locations more convenient to consuming markets and without the wholesale destruction of wildlife resources that would come with excavation of the north country's Lake Erie.

Six weeks ago a group of electric utility companies announced plans to construct a 1,800,000 kilowatt powerplant at a cost of \$180 million near Johnstown, Pa. Whereas Rampart sponsors expect the Federal Government to underwrite the entire project, the Conemaugh plant will go up and on the line without a penny of subsidy.

On the basis of the estimated costs of the two projects, it is evident that six steam-electric plants, supplying more than twice the power of Rampart, could be created at no more expense than the proposed Alaska illusion. The generating stations would have the added advantage of being built one at a time, when they are needed and where they are needed. Finally, Alaska has enough fossil fuel reserves to keep the plants in operation for centuries to come.

Mr. Speaker, I love Alaska's great natural wonderland and the people who live there. I was one of the most active workers in the campaign to bring statehood to Alaska. But the likes of Rampart has no place there or anywhere else where American taxpayers are involved, for it would be too expensive even if it had the capacity to generate a competing display of northern lights.

# IF NATIONS ONLY PAID UNITED STATES WHAT THEY OWE

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have had many inquiries recently asking about money owed the United States by other nations of the world. I believe that recent restrictive measures recommended to help the balance-of-payments question and troubles regarding the flow of gold out of our Nation has inspired the question, "Wouldn't the troubles disappear if we could collect our debts?"

The answer appears to be "Yes." It develops that foreign governments now owe the United States more than \$37 billion—which excludes all the billions which have been handed out through foreign aid since World War II.

I was pleased to note a report in the March 15, 1965, U.S. News & World Report titled "If Nations Only Paid United States What They Owe." This article summarizes the situation and presents a chart on who owes us how much which, I feel, is significant for all Americans who are genuinely concerned about our fiscal problems here at home and our balance-of-payments crisis abroad.

This article and chart, taken from the U.S. Treasury and Commerce Departments, should be called to the attention of the Members of Congress and the public alike. Under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include this article and the accompanying chart for that purpose.

## IF NATIONS ONLY PAID UNITED STATES WHAT THEY OWE

Troubles of the dollar would disappear overnight if United States could collect its debts.

Rich European nations owe America many billions. Debts date back to World War I. But those nations are making no moves to pay debts long overdue.

French President Charles de Gaulle, busy downgrading the dollar, is ignoring this hard financial fact:

France owes America more than 7 billion dollars—and the great bulk of this has been in default for decades.

If France paid her debts, the French President would not have the hundreds of millions of dollars he has been cashing in for U.S. gold.

Dozens of other nations, too, are heavily in debt to the United States.

### TOTAL: 37 BILLIONS

In all, going back to World War I, debts run up by foreign governments come to a staggering \$37 billion.

The chart on this page shows who owes the money.

Remember that these are legal debts on U.S. books. They are separate from aid programs in which the United States handed out billions free after both World War I and World War II.

Note that more than half of the debts—\$20.5 billion—dates back to borrowings made more than 45 years ago.

About 90 percent of these debts is owed by these three countries: Great Britain, France, and Italy.

France's original World War I borrowings came to \$4 billion. Interest has accumulated over the years to bring the total debt on these loans to \$6.5 billion at the end of 1964.

France does not deny that she legally owes these debts to the United States.

### FRANCE'S REBUTTAL

The French do claim, however, that repayment hinges on resumption of reparation payments by the Germans for damage done to France during World War I.

Other countries with big World War I debts to the United States have presented a similar argument: The Germans have not made good on reparations, so the debtors don't have to pay on U.S. loans.

The U.S. Government, the record shows, has never recognized any connection between solemn debts incurred by European countries and their reparations claims on Germany.

Treasury officials say privately, however, that chances are very slim of ever collecting World War I debts.

Tiny Finland, alone, has faithfully met all payments on her U.S. debt over the years.

United States has had better luck with loans made during World War II and in the postwar years.

Actually, loans were quite limited during World War II. Instead, the U.S. used lend-lease to help friendly nations. These lend-lease obligations, in turn, were settled after the war at a tiny fraction of the cost.

### POSTWAR LENDING

It was after the war that the U.S. Government became a big spender—and lender—to help nations back on their feet.

The Marshall plan alone poured more than \$16 billion into Europe as a gift.

If that money had gone out as loans the United States could now be getting back dollars when they are badly needed.

Actual debts of World War II and postwar years owed to United States on June 30, 1964, came to \$16.6 billion—with another \$6.6 billion of borrowing power available to other countries but as yet unused.

Almost all of this debt is still in good standing and repayments are being made—usually, but not always, on time.

Original loans amounted to \$38.5 billion. Borrowers, thus, have cut their postwar debt to less than half.

Many of the postwar loans, of course, have many years yet to run. Several countries—including France—have paid off some debt before it came due in order to ease the problems of the dollar.

French prepayments of World War II and postwar debts have amounted to \$630 million in recent years.

Recently, however, the French have shown no interest in further prepaying.

### WHO'S DEFAULTING NOW

Defaults on postwar debts are relatively small—167 millions as of mid-1964. These defaults are mostly by Russia, the Republic of China and Iran, and arise from unsettled lend-lease accounts.

Nations of Europe now are rich and prosperous, with gold piled high.

Problems of the U.S. dollar would disappear overnight if these nations would pay up their old debts.

The table of outstanding debts follow:

### World War I debt still owed to U.S. Government

	Billions
Britain.....	\$9.380
France.....	6.510
Italy.....	2.245
Belgium.....	.665
Russia.....	.635
Poland.....	.445
Czechoslovakia.....	.265
Other.....	.355

### World War II and postwar debt still owed to U.S. Government

	Billions
Britain.....	\$3.997
India.....	2.290
Brazil.....	.862
Japan.....	.842
Pakistan.....	.729
France.....	.637
Turkey.....	.481
Yugoslavia.....	.475
Chile.....	.443
Spain.....	.392
United Arab Republic.....	.384
Israel.....	.366
Argentina.....	.351
China (Nationalist).....	.303
Iran.....	.249
Colombia.....	.248
Germany.....	.226
Morocco.....	.207
Russia.....	.201
Mexico.....	.199
Indonesia.....	.189
Greece.....	.150
Venezuela.....	.138
Peru.....	.126
Other.....	2.111

(Source: U.S. Treasury, U.S. Department of Commerce.)

In all, foreign governments now owe the United States more than \$37 billion. This is debt on the books, including accrued interest but excluding the billions in free aid handed out after both World Wars. If foreigners paid up their old debts, this Nation's worry over the position of the dollar would disappear.

### EVENTS IN SELMA, ALA.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of ineffable sadness that I have read of the tragic events that have taken place in Selma, Ala., during the last few days. It is difficult, of course, and perhaps even dangerous to form judgments on the basis of secondary sources of information. However, in this instance the visual and photographic evidence as provided in newsreel films, television tapes, and news photos seems clear beyond the peradventure of a doubt. There has been an unnecessary and excessive resort to the use of violence on the part of the police officials of the State of Alabama in restraining a march of Negro citizens from Selma to Montgomery. When I further read that crowds of white citizens lined the highway where this terrible and bloody scene was played out and literally whooped and shouted in their enthusiasm, I felt a sinking feeling at the realization that this had taken place in America. It is not simply that our image abroad has once again been tarnished, and that we have given additional ammunition to our Communist enemies who seize every opportunity, real or fancied, to denigrate us as hypocritical in our attachment to the ideals of liberty, justice, and equality. Even more damaging than this defacement of our external image are the internal con-

sequences of these unnecessary acts of savagery and violence on the part of the Alabama officials. Their conduct has only served to exacerbate an already seriously aggravated situation. Perhaps the only saving grace in this entire tragic sequence of events is the realization that has come to many that further action must be taken to guarantee the right to register and vote to every qualified American citizen. The kind of legal obfuscation that is going on in places like Selma, Ala., is a travesty on the whole concept of equal voting rights. The events of the last few days should have made it abundantly clear that for the good of the American order—yes, for the good of the soul of America we cannot any longer permit State officials under the color of discriminatory laws to deny supposedly freeborn American citizens their right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope and pray that we will have an end to the untoward instances of violence that have taken place not only in Alabama, but in many other parts of the country as well in the developing course of the struggle for civil rights. I would also hope that this Congress would promptly address itself to the job of making every effort to insure a proper implementation of constitutional guarantees as they pertain to the precious right to cast a vote in a free election.

#### SELMA, ALA.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, the tragic and degrading events in Selma, Ala., this week have incensed every right thinking American who abhors violence, brutality, and intimidation. When law enforcement officials anywhere in this country find it necessary to turn on a peaceable group of unarmed citizens, it can only lead to the eventual destruction of our American way of life.

I do not believe we can remain silent in the face of such outrageous denials of basic human rights and decency. If such savagery as administered to the Negroes in Alabama by the Alabama State police is permitted to continue and perpetrated without protest or punishment, then the day is not far off when this country, its Constitution, and its laws will mean nothing.

These Americans, so brutally attacked in Selma, sought only their constitutional right to register and vote. They did not resist arrest. They were, however, gassed, clubbed, and beaten at random in their efforts to pursue equality. While I do not condone lawlessness or defiance of law and order, I am equally appalled at any violent or unmerciful attack upon Americans who attempt only to march peacefully in their quest for civil rights.

It is my hope that the President will assume direct authority, and take such

measures as he might consider necessary to suppress any similar occurrence of this kind in Alabama or in any other State.

#### NEED FOR PROMPT REMEDY

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the following commentary might properly be entitled "What's Wrong Here?" I do not believe there is a better way to make a case for an existing inequity than to present a specific situation. I therefore submit excerpts from a letter received from a young man in the armed services which I trust my colleagues in the House will read and give serious consideration:

I have been in the Army 19 months and was recently promoted from E-3 to E-4 and found that my wife's class Q allotment did not increase like that of a man who has only one dependent. The allotment for an E-3 and two dependents and less than 2 years' service is \$123.10 and it remains the same for an E-4 with two dependents. The allotment for an E-3 with one dependent and less than 2 years' service is \$95.20, but it moves up to \$123.10 when a man is promoted to an E-4. This doesn't seem at all equitable.

For example, one of my buddies who has the same rating as I do and a wife and no children draws the same allotment. His wife is, of course, able to take employment, whereas we have a child, which naturally requires that my wife remain at home with the baby.

President Johnson recently concluded that families with an income of less than \$3,000 annually are in the poverty class and should be given economic assistance through the Federal Government. Yet, strangely, a man in the service with two dependents receives \$83.10 for living quarters and \$123.10 per month allotment, which, with his basic pay, gives him an annual income of approximately \$2,800. The serviceman with one dependent is naturally farther down on the poverty list by the same yardstick.

If I had not worked and saved my money before coming into the service, it would have been impossible for me to provide the basic necessities along with maintaining our life insurance, automobile insurance, and other miscellaneous obligations. When a man is required to give 2 years out of his life, it certainly doesn't seem right that he should be required to use funds for which he worked and saved during his civilian life for the right and privilege of serving his country. I pass these comments on to you, not alone because of my personal situation, but because there are many others like me with whom I have talked who have so expressed themselves.

I hope and trust that Congress will do something to rectify these inequities in the near future. It probably will not affect me since I am nearing the end of my term of service, but it seems to me that this should be corrected in the interest of the men who serve our country in the future.

It is my understanding that legislation is being offered by most of the members of the esteemed Committee on Armed Services to increase military pay and correct some of these inequities which prevail. This legislation should be a must in this session of Congress.

#### TIGHTER CONTROLS OVER DRUG ABUSES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, narcotics addiction is a sickness growing in our cities. It feeds upon poverty and congestion. It strikes our young people in the most vulnerable formative years. It seeks out the troubled and disturbed.

Because this illness corrupts the society as well as the body, we have long treated it as primarily a criminal problem. It has been a criminal problem, but only because we allowed it to become so.

We must continue to treat the trafficker in illicit drugs as the criminal he is. We must remove his incentive and so stiffen the penalties that we drive him from this contemptible market.

However, in very recent times our laws have begun to reflect a surer understanding of the addict—to strike at prime causes rather than symptoms. In many areas, at last, we are no longer punishing victims, but treating patients. We are recognizing the monstrous problems of drug addiction for what it is—a contagious illness that is rapidly approaching an epidemic.

No one knows the exact extent of drug addiction in the United States. But we do know that it has been increasing at an alarming rate.

At the end of the Second World War, there was almost no addiction in this country, but now there are an estimated 100,000 addicts. Some well-informed people believe that there may be nearly twice that number.

In one typical 10-year period following the war, arrests for narcotic addiction in our major cities rose by as much as 900 percent. In one city alone, it rose by 2,000 percent over that period.

This is a problem of the very gravest concern for residents of New York City and environs. Drug addiction feeds upon the problems of cities: congestion, poverty, and frustration. And as our Nation's largest city, New York has by all odds the largest addict population—somewhere in the neighborhood of 60,000 troubled souls, more than half the Nation's total addict population.

In recent years the circle of this infection has begun to spread into the suburban and residential communities around the city. Now it is a problem of immediate concern to law enforcement officers and doctors in Westchester and Putnam Counties. Even sadder, it is a problem of personal concern to school teachers and parents.

The bill before the House today is an important step in helping our communities to counter and contain this contagion.

The so-called goof balls and the pep pill are serious health threats in themselves, but for our young people they can,

and often do, have more tragic consequences. These marginal drugs are harmful enough in themselves, but when they reach the troubled and immature—the deprived and vulnerable—in our high schools and on our streets, they can also be the first step in a journey into hopelessness and despair. They can be the catalyst to a life of tortured addiction and the crime and degradation that this entails.

This bill, by identifying these drugs and providing some controls over their use, is the opening gun in a campaign in which the people of my district have a very special interest.

Last November I called for Federal legislation to prohibit nonmedical purchases of danger drugs such as barbiturates and pep pills. I will be pleased to return to the people of Westchester and Putnam Counties and tell them this became one of the first laws passed by the Congress this session.

But I look for further reforms that will provide stiffer penalties for nonaddict pushers, remove the element of profit from this vile, illegal commerce in drugs, and meet the crisis of crime that results from addiction.

I look also for realistic enlargement of the list of drugs for which Federal treatment is available, compulsory testing to catch drug abuse among our young people before it becomes the horror of addiction, expanded use of the concept of civil commitment for addicts, enlargement of treatment facilities and post-institutional care to prevent the return of former addicts to the life of despair—the miserable cycle of destruction that typifies their lives.

These direct measures may help to bring this frightful contagion under control and limit its spread.

The costs of addiction are enormous. Recently, Life editor, James Mills estimated that the addict without private sources of funds must steal an average of \$1,000 in goods each week from the public to support a \$20- to \$30-a-day habit. When you add in the lost human potential, the cost of extra enforcement and the pathetic cost of the futile cycle of imprisonment and hospitalization that typifies the life of the average addict, you have gross cost that no nation can afford.

For the future, I look to the programs that will attack the breeding places of addiction and will strengthen the defenses of our people against such illness. The true hope for the long run is not cure of the addict or the punishment of the abuser, it is in preventing the causes. For there is no question that the root of addiction is poverty—poverty of the body and poverty of the spirit. America has no room for this archaic evil anymore.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2 and to lend their weight to a broad range of legislation that will wipe away not only the illness, but the very cause itself.

#### VIETNAM

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman

from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, South Vietnam appealed to the United States for help to meet the serious threat posed by Communist subversion and acts of terror. A series of assassinations and raids on government centers had brought the country's morale to a critical point. Responding to the appeal, President Kennedy agreed to provide greatly increased military and economic aid. Since then, we have become more and more deeply involved in South Vietnam.

To prevent a Communist takeover, the United States is now spending over \$2 million a day and it is keeping more than 25,000 American military advisers stationed there. Last month, U.S. planes took part in raids against targets in North Vietnam. These strikes were made because there was mounting evidence of direct participation by Hanoi in the struggle in the south.

The struggle is sometimes referred to as a civil war. But let us consider the true facts. Thousands of trained men have come from the north, along with a stream of equipment and ammunition. This has been the mainspring of the Communist insurgency in the south.

Although there is discontent and local recruiting by the Vietcong, the whole Communist campaign would not be possible without the support coming from Hanoi. It is a clear case of aggression, of which there is ample proof in the recent State Department white paper on "Aggression From the North."

President Johnson has said that our purpose in Vietnam is "to join in the defense and protection of freedom of a brave people who are under attack that is controlled and that is directed from outside the country." This is our pledge to the people of South Vietnam—a pledge that demands of us courage, patience, and a firm belief in the principles of freedom. I, for one, am confident that we can meet the challenge and win this struggle against Communist aggression in southeast Asia.

#### THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HULL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, it is a pleasure to insert in the Record this inspiring call to accept the challenge of citizenship which won the Voice of Democracy Contest in the State of Missouri for my constituent, Robert L. Castle of St. Joseph, Mo. Robert will now compete with winners from throughout the United States for the scholarships awarded as prizes by the

Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. I believe that Robert's thoughtful expression of the meaning of American citizenship will find affirmative response in each of us:

#### THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP, 1964-65

"The first requisite of a good citizen \* \* \* is that he shall be able and willing to pull his own weight"—so said Theodore Roosevelt. From this statement we must conclude that in our country there exists the challenge of citizenship. A challenge based upon standards which we set and as a hopeful example, follow.

In 1846 an Irish potato crop failed; that same year a new oppressive government rose to dominate Germany. The stage was set in the years following for the largest migration of humans the world had ever seen, 11 million Irish, Germans, Polish, Slavic, and Scandinavians going to a land they had never seen, but a land which was to them an oasis in a desert of starvation and political turmoil. It wouldn't be easy to pull up stakes and disregard what one's family had labored for and cherished for generations, but we must remember when starvation for liberty overcomes the fear of the unknown road ahead it is only expected that the choice will be the road to freedom.

Let us look at these people and their willingness to accept the challenge of citizenship. Imagine the expressions on these immigrants' faces as their ships steamed into New York harbor and they gazed upon the majestic Statue of Liberty, and read the words inscribed on her bronze pedestal:

"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free.

The wretched refuse of your teeming shores. Send these the homeless, tempest-tost to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

These millions were the tired, the poor, the huddled masses yearning to breathe free. They were the homeless, the tempest-tost, the wretched refuse of shores polluted by the stagnant waters of autocracy and famine.

Now before them lay a new life, and a golden door which would let them, the multitudes of nations pass through.

Those immigrants of long ago came able and willing to do their parts in strengthening the ideals of citizenship. They realized, far better than we do today, that to maintain the vision of freedom they brought with them they would have to work unceasingly to preserve it.

The challenge of citizenship is a full-time job, one which must not be neglected. It must be exercised by being informed; remember many people don't have the privilege of knowing the truth about the outside world. Exercise your citizenship by being active in your political party and by voting; remember, many people are given only one candidate and one party which they may support. Exercise your citizenship by having faith in your government; remember many people in our world have lost faith in their government because it has abused them and their rights. Exercise your citizenship by voicing your opinion on important issues; remember many of the world's people are forced to keep their opinions to themselves. But above all our challenge of citizenship should be exercised by our being familiar with our Government and its operation; millions of the world's population are told only one thing about their government—it's the parties' business, not the peoples.

Our challenge of citizenship is being fulfilled by those who care whether or not our Nation can survive this time of change and recurring clashes between Eastern and Western doctrines.

Citizenship is like a play, in that the producer is the taxpayer, the director is our Government, and the cast is you.

Citizenship is patriotism, a boundless loyalty, a sworn allegiance, but more than all of these citizenship is an overwhelming abundance of belief.

The challenge of citizenship can be fulfilled and will be fulfilled if we are prepared as were our forefathers to pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor.

#### BILLS TO BENEFIT HEALTH OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce three bills which, if approved by this Congress, will make a significant and enduring contribution to the health of the American people.

My distinguished colleague in the Senate, LISTER HILL, has introduced identical measures with the same objective. That objective is to provide a concrete basis for the great aim of the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke: to match medical research potential with public health achievement by merging the worlds of medical science and medical practice.

The first of these bills calls for aiding the establishment of regional medical complexes for research and treatment in heart disease, cancer, and stroke—3 diseases which together account for 7 out of every 10 deaths in the United States each year.

In the words of the President's Commission:

Each premature death from heart disease, cancer or stroke is a personal tragedy. But each preventable death is a national reproach, for the pace of science is bringing more within our reach, but the pace of application allows them to slip through our grasp.

The bill which I want to introduce at this time is a step to bring about a closer partnership of our health and medical resources. Its purpose is to enable the medical profession and medical institutions of the Nation—through a grants program of the Federal Government—to make available to their patients the latest advances in the diagnosis and treatment of heart disease, cancer, and stroke, and other major diseases.

It calls for an appropriation of \$50 million for the first year, and additional sums for each of the next 4 fiscal years, for grants to assist public or nonprofit medical schools, hospitals, and other research institutions to plan, establish, and operate regional medical complexes for research, training, and demonstration activities. Each complex would consist of one or more medical centers, one or more categorical research centers, and one or more diagnostic and treatment stations.

The centers could offer open-heart surgery, advanced and very high voltage radiation therapy, and advanced disease detection methods. Their regional nature would enable every patient requir-

ing such procedures to have access to them. The centers will help the practicing physician keep in physical touch with the latest medical knowledge and techniques and the most efficient methods.

The bill also gives the Surgeon General the authority to appoint a National Advisory Council on Medical Complexes which will advise and assist him in making and administering grants.

President Johnson, in his health message to Congress on January 7 of this year, stated the case for these complexes in the following words:

When we consider that the economic cost of heart disease alone amounts to 540,000 lost man-years annually—worth some \$2.5 billion—the urgency and value of effective action is unmistakable.

The second bill will serve to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy. It authorizes grants to these schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, provides for the extension of our student loan program and for continuation of aid in construction of teaching facilities.

As all of you well know, these are not new problems which we confront here for the first time. After consideration in two previous Congresses of bills to authorize grants for the construction and improvement of medical, dental, and public health facilities and to financially assist students attending such institutions, I was gratified in 1963 by the passage of these bills as the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act which authorized a 3-year construction grants program and loans to students. The act was only a beginning, for it authorized only part of what was needed then, and even less of what is needed today.

But the act was a beginning, and it must not be permitted to lapse. One of the purposes of the bill I am introducing today is to extend the construction and student loan programs of that act to July 1, 1971, with an extension to 1974 of the loan program to permit students to complete their education. The amount of the student loan may not exceed \$2,500 under provisions of this bill.

However, grants for construction and loans alone are not enough. As the President has said:

We must face the fact that high operating costs and shortage of operating funds are jeopardizing our health professions education system. Several underfinanced medical and dental schools are threatened with failure to meet educational standards. New schools are slow to start, even when construction funds are available due to lack of operating funds.

Therefore, the present bill would also authorize a 5-year program of grants to assist the schools of the health professions in improving the quality of their educational programs. To achieve this, it calls for an initial appropriation of \$20 million for the fiscal year ending June 1966 and such sums as may be needed for succeeding fiscal years. Under its provisions the Surgeon General shall approve the grants after consulting with a National Advisory Council on Medical and Dental Education, also established therein.

The bill further provides for a 5-year grants program for establishing scholarship funds. These grants will be made to educational institutions on a formula basis, and will provide scholarships not to exceed \$2,500 for any school year. The inclusion of this section reflects the tremendous investment now required for pursuing a medical education. It is a sad instance of economic discrimination that half of last June's medical school graduates came from families with incomes of over \$10,000 a year. Surely, there are many young people from low- and middle-income families well qualified to become physicians and dentists, but who are blocked by lack of finances from realizing their abilities.

As the population rapidly grows, and as disease incidence increases proportionally, the doctor to patient ratio grows wider. Loans to students are not enough to encourage increased enrollment. The low salaries paid during the several years of required internship and residency are hardly enough to cover the living expenses of a young doctor and his family, much less to allow for repaying a sizable loan. Only scholarships, such as provided for in this bill, can effectively deal with this problem of finances. Scholarships, awarded to those medical and dental students who would otherwise not be able to undertake or complete their training, will for the first time offer broad opportunities for a medical education to young people from families of modest income.

In the past three Congresses I introduced bills to provide Federal assistance to the States in awarding scholarships to students of medicine and dentistry. The scholarship provision was stricken from those bills. I ask this Congress to carefully consider this bill and not take similar action. The need for qualified, well-trained health personnel is growing increasingly grave. It is obvious that previous measures, though helpful, have not been enough. We must not fail this time.

The third bill which I introduce today is concerned with the important question of the accessibility of medical knowledge and its effective communication.

As I implied while discussing the regional medical complex bill, the war on disease cannot be launched and waged on one front while other fronts are disregarded. Specifically, research grants are wasted unless adequate facilities exist to apply the results of research. Medical centers will remain empty without qualified, well-trained personnel to staff them. The effectiveness of all of these is limited by the present inadequate system of medical libraries and medical information communication.

As the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke noted:

The forward sweep of medical science has brought about a kind of instant obsolescence in medical knowledge.

Although recognizing the splendid work and potential of the National Library of Medicine, the Commission concluded:

The present state of most medical libraries in the United States is lamentable,

largely because libraries have not received their due share of the greatly increased attention and funding for research.

#### The Commission warned:

Unless major attention is directed to improvement of our national medical library base, the continued and accelerated generation of scientific knowledge will become increasingly an exercise in futility.

The bill which I present to you today proposes specific action to assure that we do not stand idly by to see a worsening of this "exercise in futility." This bill, in its main features, provides for—

First. Assisting the construction of new and the rehabilitation of existing medical library facilities, the costs not to exceed 75 percent of the cost of construction.

Second. Assisting in the training of medical librarians, cost not to exceed \$1 billion for any fiscal year up to June 30, 1970.

Third. Supporting fellowships for special scientific projects, the costs not to exceed \$500,000 for any fiscal year up to June 30, 1970.

Fourth. Assisting in the conduct of research and development in the field of medical library science, the costs not to exceed \$3 million for any fiscal year up to June 30, 1970.

Fifth. Assisting in improving and expanding the basic resources of medical libraries, the costs not to exceed \$3 million for any fiscal year up to June 30, 1970.

Sixth. Assisting in the development of a national system of regional medical libraries, the costs not to exceed \$2½ million for any fiscal year up to June 30, 1970.

Seventh. Supporting of biomedical publication of a nonprofit nature and for related purposes, the costs not to exceed \$1½ million for any fiscal year up to June 30, 1970.

Eighth. Authorizing the Surgeon General under certain circumstances to establish branches of the National Library of Medicine, the costs not to exceed \$2 million for any fiscal year up to June 30, 1970.

I am certain that these provisions will greatly advance the orderly accumulation and dissemination of medical knowledge, a function essential to continued rapid medical progress. And I am also convinced that this legislation could best be administered by the National Library of Medicine—an organization which is keenly aware of the library needs of medical schools, the practicing physician, and the scientific community in general.

In conclusion, I urge all of my colleagues to give much consideration to the details of these bills and to the national health needs which have prompted their drafting. As medical knowledge steadily accumulates—as important research advances are being daily made—we must now look with a critical eye at the whole health picture. It is no longer enough to consider research alone. Training and education, widespread clinical application of research findings, and effective communication of medical knowledge are vital cornerstones upon which a healthy nation must be built.

Action must be taken now, for needs are great, but the means of relief—involving time-consuming construction, training, and expansion of facilities—cannot be implemented overnight. Our goal is health for the millions—it must not be less.

#### CHARGES FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a memorial from the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, as follows:

#### SENATE MEMORIAL 7

Memorial opposing the proposal before the Congress of the United States to charge cooperators of soil and water conservation districts for technical assistance

Whereas the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is the principal agency charged with providing technical assistance through locally controlled and operated soil and water conservation districts to landowners carrying out a conservation program on their lands; and Whereas the Federal budget for the fiscal year of 1966 proposes to establish a revolving fund of \$20 million and to charge soil and water conservation district cooperators for this assistance; and

Whereas the very people who need this assistance the most will be the ones unable to purchase it under the proposal to charge for this assistance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of New Mexico, That it opposes the proposal before the Congress of the United States to charge cooperators of soil and water conservation districts for technical assistance furnished by the Soil Conservation Service and that it urges that the amount of \$20 million be restored to the Federal budget for the fiscal year of 1966; and be it

Resolved, That additional amounts be appropriated by the Congress of the United States to accelerate the assistance being furnished by soil and water conservation districts to landowners in New Mexico; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Members from New Mexico in the Congress of the United States.

MACK EASLEY,

President, New Mexico Senate.

#### SELMA, ALA.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, the only redeeming feature—if it can be so described—of the tragedy at Selma, Ala., will be if the revulsion and horror experienced by decent Americans every-

where will hasten the deliverance of the victims of the uncivilized government of Alabama.

Our concern and compassion for the suffering Negro people of Selma and elsewhere in the South must be translated into effective action. As I wired the President of the United States yesterday, we must let Governor Wallace know that free Americans cannot be treated as serfs by his despotic forces. The full might of Federal authority must be exercised to impress upon the arrogant Governor that his defiance of the Constitution and the laws of the United States must end forthwith. The people of the United States cannot allow one of the States of the Union to degenerate into a Gestapo police state that brutally denies the constitutional right of citizens peacefully to petition their government.

We who worked for the enactment of the historic Civil Rights Act in the last Congress must brook no delay in acting upon the additional legislation to enforce voting rights that is so urgently required.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert below the text of my telegram to the President together with telegrams from residents of New Jersey that voice the sentiments of all law-abiding Americans who believe in the principles of equal rights and equal justice under law upon which our Government was founded:

THE PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.:

No right-thinking American can read the dispatches of the violence in Selma, Ala., without a feeling of repulsion and sorrow that his fellow citizens can be subjected to such pain and humiliation in an effort to secure the rights due them under our Constitution. The vicious treatment of defenseless, orderly marchers, including women and children, by State troopers is unworthy of a sovereign State of these United States and puts Alabama outside the pale of civilized society. The challenge to our democratic principles by the racist Alabama government can be tolerated no longer by the rest of America. The national conscience demands vigorous action to safeguard human rights and dignity against brutal officials who are devoid of elemental decency or compassion. Inaction by Federal Government can result only in additional tragedies to helpless citizens who must look to the Federal Government for protection in their desperate plight. I respectfully appeal to you to exercise the full might of Federal authority to impress upon the arrogant Governor Wallace that his defiance of the Constitution and laws of the United States must end forthwith.

Let Governor Wallace know that free Americans cannot be treated as serfs by his despotic forces.

JOSEPH G. MINISH.

NEWARK, N.J., March 9, 1965.

Congressman JOSEPH G. MINISH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

Following telegram sent to President Johnson:

"Conditions have progressed to the point in Selma, Ala., where your continued silence and inaction threatens the very foundation of our democratic way of life where women and children are being bull-whipped clubbed and tear-gassed, which approaches the brutality of the Nazis under the domination of Hitler. We call upon you as the President of the United States, elected on the promise of advancing the cause of freedom for all people, to take immediate steps to use the full

force of the Federal Government to put an end to this bestiality or America will forfeit the right to assume leadership of the free world."

NEWARK BRANCH OF NAACP,  
REV. BOYD CANTRELL,

President.

NEWARK, N.J., March 8, 1965.

Congressman JOSEPH B. MINISH,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

We are shocked at the brutality which occurred in Selma on Sunday. District 3, IUE-AFL-CIO, therefore calls upon you to take immediate steps to assure safety of Dr. Martin Luther King and his followers in their courageous efforts to hold a peaceful march for voting rights tomorrow from Selma to Montgomery, Ala., response requested.

MILTON WEIHRACH,

President.

EAST ORANGE, N.J.,

March 9, 1965.

Hon. JOSEPH G. MINISH,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

The Gestapo tactics used by the State police in Selma, Ala., against the Negro people can only bring about a state of civil strife that can spread across the Nation. The vicious clubbing and gassing of defenseless citizens will not be tolerated long, even by those that believe in passive resistance. I call on you to use your influence with Congress and the White House for Federal intervention in the Alabama disgrace.

HAROLD J. SMITH.

EAST ORANGE, N.J.,

March 9, 1965.

Congressman JOSEPH G. MINISH,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

I appeal to you to use the power of your office to put a stop to the beatings of Negroes in Alabama and elsewhere in the South. Also, do something to aid the Negroes to vote in the South.

Very truly yours,

JESSE JEFFRIES, JR.

# A GREAT CHALLENGE TO PRESERVE OUR NATIONAL HERITAGE

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when President Johnson sent to the Congress his excellent message on conservation a large segment of the communications media responded enthusiastically and constructively to the challenge the President set before us.

To my knowledge, none of those responses has been more intelligently written or persuasive than an editorial column which appeared in last Sunday's—March 7, 1965—edition of the Allentown, Pa., Call-Chronicle.

Mr. W. D. Reimert, managing editor of the Call-Chronicle newspapers in Allentown, is the author of the column. I am confident it will be of interest to the distinguished Members of the House.

Mr. Reimert is among Pennsylvania's finest editorial writers. He has also been, for a number of years, one of the most effective voices we have had in the battle

to conserve and protect the great natural beauty which is our heritage in the Lehigh and Delaware River Valleys.

The words he wrote last Sunday are not transitory. They deserve to be read and listened to beyond the brief span of time too many of us allow our daily newspaper.

For what Mr. Reimert is saying applies equally to all regions and all people in America. I hope that each of my colleagues will find the time to read this extraordinary and excellent column in defense of "America, the Beautiful."

The Allentown Call is one of the most influential newspapers among the people of my district, although it is published in an adjoining county.

Throughout the years, the Call has consistently displayed its concern for the natural beauty of the area it serves, not only through the writings of Mr. Reimert and other members of its staff, but also through the publication of some of the most beautiful and genuinely illustrative photographs it has been my pleasure to see in a newspaper.

It is a privilege, at this time, to insert the text of Mr. Reimert's column as part of the RECORD of these proceedings:

## AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL—KEEP IT THAT WAY! (By W. D. Reimert)

President Johnson's recent message to Congress on the beautification of America is considered a part of the heart of the Great Society and as such it has been greeted with a certain amount of ridicule from some quarters.

It should not be.

This is a beautiful land, but for some time there has been a public awareness that much of this beauty has been destroyed and more of it will be destroyed by the population explosion unless corrective measures are taken and restraints are imposed.

Some communities and some individuals are doing something about it. We have, for instance, antilittering laws and zoning ordinances and programs for ending stream pollution and other programs to set aside large areas for recreation as well as the preservation of our forests.

But at best these efforts have been haphazard. There has been too little cooperation between the States and even between adjacent communities. Cities, towns, and villages have been awakened to the fact that because of lack of planning, there is too little space for play and recreation. Too often our rivers and streams are little more than open sewers. Our woodlands have been desecrated; the landscape has been blighted by junkyards (5 million automobiles are junked each year). The steel industry used to gobble them up. It no longer does so and there are no adequate disposal plans on the books; the air we breathe has been poisoned by industrial fumes, smoke, and dust; our scenery has been ruined by thoughtless and unregulated use of billboards; our seaboard is vast honkytonks and so are most of our mountain vacation areas. For quiet and natural beauty it is necessary to seek out the National and State parks and the less-developed Caribbean islands. Even the latter are being threatened by commercialism.

Nature on its own is invariably clean and beautiful. It is only the hand of man that defouls it and makes it ugly. And once deterioration sets in, it becomes dreadfully expensive if not prohibitive to restore the damage. We have paid dearly for our neglect in this respect and we need to take necessary steps to preserve what we have.

America is not going to remain forever a roomy place. To date we have had space to spare. When things have become ugly and unattractive and unhealthy, we have been able to flee them for unspoiled areas. That possibility is not going to exist indefinitely. Present estimates call for a population of 400 million in the United States early in the next century. We need to start planning now to be sure that what space there is is widely used.

Vision and planning have always paid off in this regard. Many years ago, the city of Allentown at the inspired suggestion of the late Gen. Harry C. Trexler took steps to acquire land on both sides of the Little Lehigh to form the so-called Allentown watershed. As a result, the city has found it has an ample supply of reasonably clean water for the foreseeable future. The acquisition of large tracts of land along Cedar Creek, Trout Creek, and the Jordan, have insured attractive recreational areas together with the Little Lehigh. It does not take much imagination to figure how impossible it would be to acquire these assets today and to restore them.

By contrast the Lehigh River has not benefited by planning. One of Pennsylvania's most beautiful waterways, it has for years been polluted by industrial wastes and the effluent of coal mines. Only recently, thanks to State clean stream programs, have some of its waters become fit to swim in and have fish been able to live in them. Hopefully, this waterway winding through the hilly Pennsylvania countryside will someday afford recreational pleasure for hundreds of thousands and afford a wholesome water source as well.

This in general is the kind of thing President Johnson is talking about—the reclamation of our heritage of natural beauty in these United States and its preservation by sensible steps on the part of individual communities and communities together and individual States and the States together.

Briefly he wants to:

Broaden existing water pollution programs under a 3-year \$20 million appropriation of matching grants to States and localities; to set up a new Water Pollution Control Agency.

Strengthen enforcement of the Clean Air Act and increase appropriations for this purpose.

Remove junkyards and billboards along highways.

Establish 12 new national recreational areas.

Promote open space areas around cities.

The heart of his program is not to simply have the Government in Washington take over the full cost and the responsibility of preserving our natural beauty and cleaning up the messes we have created, but to provide the leadership for such a program with local and State money bearing their full share of the cost.

What is the matter with that?

As Life magazine recently said:

"The United States already possesses everything else it needs to renovate itself, save public determination. The governmental tools, technology and wealth are all at hand. Moreover, we can make sense out of our surroundings without resorting to authoritarianism or fiscal irresponsibility. The role of the Federal Government should be to inspire and lead, not simply to spend. State and local governments, and private industry, must take on the main weight. Some of the most disagreeable aspects of our environment are the result of shortsighted tax cutting. Courage and decisive leadership can help correct these—provided, as always, that we as a nation really want them corrected."

"We can and should work to the time when the United States is at least determined to turn a decent proportion of its vast energies to making its cities fair and its land lovely

again. In the meantime it is only proper that we guard what we have with extra vigilance."

#### ALABAMA'S SHAME

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McGRATH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to believe that the television newsreels and photographs I have seen in newspapers these recent mornings which have been taken in the State of Alabama, United States of America. The scenes of helmeted, gas-masked, club-swinging law enforcement officers beating, herding, prodding, forced-marching, gassing and pointing rifles at Negroes look exactly like newsreels and photographs I have seen taken in the Congo, Vietnam, Indonesia, and strife-ridden areas of less-favored parts of the world.

I viewed such newsreels and photographs made in the Congo, Vietnam, Indonesia, and other places with sadness. I view such newsreels and photographs taken in the State of Alabama, United States of America, with abhorrence.

I have tried to imagine what I would think if I were a resident of the Congo, Vietnam, Indonesia, or somewhere else in Africa or Asia and saw such newsreels and photographs taken in the United States—the same United States which has spent the blood of its young men and the funds of its citizens trying to bring democracy and tranquillity to emerging nations.

The result is not pleasant to contemplate.

How long are our citizens to be expected to react peaceably to beatings, herdings, proddings, gassings, and forced marches before they are pushed beyond human endurance and reply in kind? Imagine the newsreels and photographs which would be published throughout the world if that terrible day should arrive.

The United States is engaged in a seemingly endless campaign to enlighten the emerging peoples as to the desirability of American-style democracy. Events in Alabama are most assuredly having the opposite effect.

From our own standpoint, it should be deeply disturbing to all Americans that the Governor of Alabama decided that Negro marchers in Selma would disturb the State's law and order and interfere with the State's commerce even before the marchers assembled and the character of their demonstration could be known.

Civil rights must be extended to all men, who are most assuredly created equal.

Americans must stop fighting Americans. These terrible scenes which leap from the television sets and newspaper pages must be ended.

If the United States is to lead the world in and toward democracy, we

must prove ourselves worthy of that leadership. And the proof must begin in Alabama, now.

As today's New York Times commented editorially on Sunday's disgraceful episode at Selma:

If this is described as law enforcement, it is misnamed. It is nothing more nor less than race-conscious officialdom run amuck. It disgraces not only the State of Alabama but every citizen of the country in which it happens.

#### RADIO AND TELEVISION TIME AND POLITICAL CANDIDATES

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, recently the able Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, the Honorable E. William Henry, addressed the Commonwealth Club of California on a subject of great importance not only to every Member of this body but to every person in this land who seeks public office.

While there may be debate among us as to Chairman Henry's suggestions, I believe we would generally agree he has stated the problems concerning radio and television time and political candidates clearly.

This is an excellent discussion of these problems. Under unanimous consent, I include Chairman Henry's address in the RECORD and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

ADDRESS OF E. WILLIAM HENRY, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION, BEFORE THE COMMONWEALTH CLUB OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., JANUARY 15, 1965<sup>1</sup>

Back in the days of Franklin Roosevelt, a fashionable girl's boarding school close to Washington was privileged to have a headmistress with a nationwide reputation for being competent, fair, and very strict. An acquaintance of mine then attending this school was the daughter of old friends of President and Mrs. Roosevelt. One afternoon she received an invitation to spend Saturday at the White House as the guest of its occupants. Excitedly and eagerly she accepted.

About 3 p.m. that Saturday afternoon it began to snow heavily and at 5 o'clock showed no signs of letting up. At that point the headmistress received a call from a White House secretary requesting permission, on behalf of the President, for the young lady to remain overnight due to the weather conditions. The headmistress replied in her most polite, even-tempered tones that this was impossible since the rules required all students to be back on the premises by 9 p.m. sharp. The White House secretary absorbed that gentle rebuff in silence and asked the headmistress to hold on.

In a moment a familiar voice was heard on the telephone—none other than F.D.R. himself. In his jocular, most persuasive manner he explained that he had not had a chance to visit with the young student all day, that he

very much wanted to do so, and that he would provide her with transportation back to school early the next morning. "Could she possibly spend the night with me at the White House," the President asked. The headmistress replied, "Mr. President, you have your rules for running the Government, and I have mine for running this school. I am sorry to disappoint you, but we can't make an exception—even in your case."

I often think of this story as I sit in my office contemplating FCC rules. My office is encased in one of those gray, monolithic structures which appear to have been built by the WPA, and poured from a mold used by the Greeks in the declining years of their glory. Our particular structure is shaped like a baroque hour glass, and after 2½ years of riding the same elevator, I still have to think twice before remembering which way to turn to go to my office. To many people our agency represents merely another faceless amorphous collection of Government employees who speak only *federalese*, and whose cerebral processes are confined to the strict interpretation of narrowly conceived rules to which they, like our headmistress, admit no exception.

However, appearances are deceiving, and inside the view is very different. We are located on Pennsylvania Avenue, midway between the White House and Capitol Hill, and it is sometimes noisier inside the Commission than on the street below at rush hour. We ponder and we debate. We often laugh, and sometimes feel like crying. We handle difficult questions of policy, and we try, I assure you, to be statesmen.

You know what a statesman is, of course. That's a fellow who stands upright due to equal pressure from all sides.

In short, we conduct public business and are thus an integral part of the democratic process of our Nation. In various ways the interests of the people—and recognition of our responsibility to them—penetrate our granite walls much as the morning sunshine floods a greenhouse.

As an example of something that recently penetrated our walls, let me quote two recent newspaper articles:

Item 1, the Washington Post, Sunday, January 10, 1965: "Abraham Lincoln once told how it cost him 75 cents to run for Congress in 1846. He said: 'I made the canvass on my own horse; my entertainment, being at the house of friends, cost me nothing; and my only outlay was 75 cents for a barrel of cider, which some farmhands insisted I should treat to.'"

Item 2, the Washington Evening Star, September 8, 1964: "Representative Carl Elliott, of Alabama, 16 years in Congress and for the last 4 years a member of the powerful House Rules Committee, leaves office at the end of this session faced with the problem of raising \$20,000 to pay outstanding campaign bills from his unsuccessful, statewide primary race this past June. His first primary race (16 years ago) cost \$12,000, of which, he said recently, \$7,500 was his own money."

These stories are signs of the times—not straws in the wind. They raise directly one of the most important and recurring problems facing our democracy—the cost of political campaigning. The FCC is directly involved in this question because of our responsibilities under the law with respect to political broadcasting.

Throughout the years in the field of broadcasting perhaps no single question has generated as much controversy and debate—both within the FCC and without—as section 315 of the Communications Act, that part of the law whose requirement has become a household word. I refer, of course, to its provision for equal time.

This law touches several concepts of the utmost importance to a democratic society. So I want to consider with you today not

<sup>1</sup> Several portions of this address were omitted from the oral presentation due to time limitations.

just the equal time requirement, but also the tremendously high cost of political broadcast time, and the proper role of broadcasting in the political arena.

First of all, let's discuss the bedrock principle of section 315—equality.

How many common phrases bear witness to the depth of man's response to the idea of equality—"All men were created equal," "equal justice under law," "equal protection of the law," "equal rights," "equal opportunities."

How many phrases suggest our abhorrence for equality's opposite—"favoritism," "special interests," "special privilege," "discrimination."

The belief that political candidates should have equal opportunities to reach the public thus has an ancient and honorable lineage. And it is no wonder that the phrase "equal time" evokes such an immediate response in the American imagination.

The idea is simplicity itself, and is quickly understood. Each candidate is entitled to equal time to present his views. Wives have been known to use it against husbands, husbands against mothers-in-law; and at least one secretary I know has used it against her boss.

Yet this idea—the heart of section 315 of the Communications Act—is under heavy attack. For years, some broadcasters have opposed it, and sought its elimination from the law. Many newspapers—often as a reflex action—have castigated it. And a little over a month ago, the presidents of two television networks called, in separate speeches, for its repeal.

Robert Sarnoff of NBC called television journalism a "shackled giant" and the equal-time rule one of its most restricting shackles. In his view, "a law that requires a Government agency to direct the manner in which the public may be informed in an election campaign is inconsistent with the aims of democracy."

Frank Stanton, of CBS, was even more colorful. He called the equal-time rule "a discredited and unworkable legal relic of a generation ago," and said "it is section 315 that keeps our political methods a century behind our communications." Decrying the refusal of Congress to suspend the law during the 1964 campaign, he urged the electorate to speak out for its repeal "with such a loud and unmistakable demand that neither political stalling nor parliamentary juggling can silence or contradict it."

These are harsh words from men of good will and good faith. And we can be sure they will be joined by others in seeking to persuade the new Congress to take section 315 off the books. The banner that waves over their bandwagon is labeled "freedom"—freedom from undue restrictions, freedom to report the whole truth, freedom to bring 20th century communications into 20th century politics. This freedom, they say, cannot live with the rule of equality, and hence equality must go.

Well, at the risk of being run over by this bandwagon, I would like to enlist today as an advocate of equality. For my fundamental response to them is rather like Andrew Jackson's instruction to his troops at the Battle of New Orleans: "Boys elevate them guns a little lower."

Let's take a look at the law itself. Section 315 stems from a provision of the Radio Act of 1927. Its essential features have always been the same: First, a requirement that if a broadcaster permits a candidate to use his facilities, he must offer "equal opportunities" to all other legally qualified candidates for the same office; and second, a requirement that broadcasters refrain from censoring candidates who use their facilities.

In 1952, Congress found that a number of broadcasters were charging candidates more for the use of their facilities than they did commercial advertisers for the same amount

of time. It therefore inserted a sentence prohibiting this kind of cost discrimination.

In 1959, Congress became concerned lest section 315—as interpreted by the FCC in the *Lar Daly* case—unduly disrupt broadcasters' legitimate journalist functions. It added a provision exempting four kinds of news programs from the "equal-time" and "no censorship" requirements. At the same time, it expressly reminded broadcasters of their obligation—with or without section 315—to be fair—"to operate in the public interest and to afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance."

You will notice that Congress has thus attempted to draw a line between two different functions—on the one hand, a candidate's use of broadcast facilities solely for his own political purposes, and on the other, his appearance in various kinds of news programs to serve primarily the broadcaster's purposes.

Let me here emphasize that this distinction touches the heart of the controversy surrounding section 315.

At bottom, we have a struggle between opposing aspects of what political broadcasting is and should be.

To the broadcaster, political programing is journalism—the irreverent but legitimate daughter of the newspaper. In political programs the broadcaster seeks to explain the political news, and to select the times when the electorate will see the candidate, and when it will not.

To the candidate, however, the broadcasting medium is simply the extension of a platform, a town hall, a city park—a giant means for his personal communication with the electorate, made possible by modern technology. From this point of view the biggest fact on the horizon has nothing to do with journalism. It has to do with money. For the great bulk of political broadcasting in this country is created and paid for by candidates and their supporters, with broadcasters supplying time and facilities for a fee.

Broadcasting is often an extremely profitable enterprise, particularly the television industry. Stations in the top 50 markets average some \$1,425,000 each year in pretax profits. These earnings represent some 36 percent of average gross revenue. Average return on investments differ widely, but some confidential statistics in our files would make all of you here today green with envy. Some stations earn two or three times their total initial investment in after tax, net profits each year.

Television time is a luxury item with a luxury price tag.

While the actual expense figures for the 1964 election are not yet in, it is estimated that \$40 million may well have been spent for radio and television time alone, of which half was spent at the national level. And these funds—all these millions—come from political contributions by individuals such as yourself, which are nondeductible, "after tax" money.

One-half hour in prime time for a network nationwide broadcast costs a candidate about \$60,000. One hour usually runs somewhere around \$100,000.

In San Francisco, you have four commercial television stations—three affiliated with a network and one independently programed. What do you suppose it costs a candidate to buy a single 10-second prime time announcement on an affiliated station? It is \$400. If he wants to economize, he may purchase 10 seconds on your independent station for only \$225. For the same 10 seconds on one of the New York network stations he would pay about \$1,250, or \$125 per second. No wonder that the estimated costs for the last New York senatorial race are in the neighborhood of \$4 million.

No wonder these money problems have been dubbed "bucklash."

Consider also, for example, the Indiana candidates who want television coverage in the northwestern part of their State, and must buy Chicago audiences. Similarly, congressional candidates in the First District of California can rely on Eureka stations for televised access to the northern part of their district, but for coverage of other large counties—Napa, Sonoma, Mendocino, Marin—they must pay San Francisco prices.

The latest statistics indicate that at the national level the major parties spend somewhere between 35 and 40 percent of their campaign funds for television and radio, and while the proportion is less at the State and local levels, it is rising rapidly.

Reconsider, for a moment, Carl Elliott's race for the U.S. House of Representatives last fall, which I mentioned earlier today. Having spent more than \$20,000 of his own money in 1962, he was faced in 1964 with an even tougher race. The night before election he found that the only way to counteract a piece of last-minute opposition propaganda was to go on television. Time was of the essence—nothing else would do. It cost him \$15,000, and he had to mortgage his automobile in the process. Next day the voters turned him out.

Carl Elliott knows firsthand the truth of Will Rogers' comment that: "Politics has got so expensive that it takes lots of money to even get beat with."

The sad fact is that more than one candidate has mortgaged his house, hocked his car, and saddled his future with a crushing load of debt in order to pay for broadcasting time. And often the debtor ends up on the losing side—sometimes after years of service in high elective office. The tragedy for the individuals involved is serious. Its larger effects upon the country may be disastrous.

Think of the qualified people who never enter the race because they have heard of such tragedies or because they can't muster the initial resources. Think of the candidates who do enter, laden with political commitments to those who have bought support as they would a market commodity. Even a nation committed to free enterprise should not overwhelmingly tempt a candidate to sell his political favors.

It was once a proud boast in this country that any mother's son might become President. We will never know how large a part that boast played in the American dream—the vision that drew millions to our shores. Over the years, however, something has happened to it. One hears it advanced—if at all—in a shamefaced or ironic manner. More and more one hears the opposite belief expressed—that only a rich man can hold our highest elective office.

We simply cannot afford a result so fundamentally at odds with all this country stands for.

I believe, therefore, that this Nation should reduce the cost of political broadcasting—the cost to candidates in terms of money, and the cost to the public in terms of prostituted patronage.

All right, say opponents of section 315. The way to reduce effectively the cost of political broadcasting is to repeal this law. Repeal, they say, will permit broadcasters to give more free time to major candidates, without having to give equal time to every would-be dogcatcher. Break the shackles, they repeat, and broadcasters will still be fair to all parties.

To this argument let me adopt Speaker Sam Rayburn's adage that "the most valuable phrase in the English language is 'just a minute.'"

Let's revert to fundamentals. Those who seek repeal of the equal-time rule are asking for a great deal more than the freedom to disregard frivolous candidates. In dealing with

major candidates, they want the right to pick and choose, to broadcast some of their words but not all of them. They want the right to censor, and to treat candidates unequally.

There is nothing inherently sinister in this. What the advocates of repeal have in mind is journalism in the classic sense. They want to present, not the candidate's version of his campaign, but their version of it—not necessarily the candidate's view of the facts in the case, but their version of the truth as they see it. To do this, they must select, they must edit, they must pick and choose. Their guiding star must be their own news judgment. And the rule of equal time and no censorship—which makes so much sense when we think of the candidate on a broadcast platform—is anathema to their journalistic endeavor, whether there are 2 candidates or 20.

Let's consider what repeal would mean—both for paid time and for free time.

As we have seen, from the broadcaster's point of view, paid political broadcasting is simply a business. Moreover, however much free time may be donated in the future, this business will remain a large one. Politicians will still buy, and broadcasters will still sell.

With respect to paid political broadcasts, section 315 performs a valuable function. It ensures all legally qualified candidates the right to purchase equal amounts of time at the same rates and in comparable segments of the broadcast day. It requires that candidates be charged no more for time than advertisers would be charged for comparable purposes. And it makes certain the candidate's right to use the time he purchases as he sees fit, without interference or censorship by broadcasters.

A great many broadcasters agree. In a speech last April, Mr. Lawrence Rogers, president of Taft Broadcasting Co., made a statement well worth pondering. He said:

"It would be no problem at all for a small town radio operator to be taken over by a machine boss without section 315. In my own experience I have seen political machines deliberately try to buy all the time on the air for a given party or candidate, in order to freeze out the opposition. Section 315 protects the operator from such tactics. And it does so clearly and firmly."

Is there any reason to undermine these requirements? The basic complaint is that section 315 requires equal treatment for splinter groups and crackpot candidates. The blunt fact, however, is minority and fringe candidates almost never have the funds to pay for the kind of broadcasting done by the major parties. The fundamental attack on the requirement of equality simply does not apply to paid political broadcasting.

And now, what about free time? Free time includes not only the donation of a platform for use of the candidate as he sees fit. It likewise includes a wide variety of programs—interviews, press conferences, debates, discussions, etc. Such programs are sometimes outlets for candidates, sometimes vehicles for journalism, and often both at the same time.

In this situation, it is well to remember, one man's shackles are another man's freedom. The repeal of section 315 would profoundly alter the conditions of political debate in this country. Do we want to give broadcasters the power to censor political debate? Do we really want to put broadcasters in a position to say to candidates, "If you want to reach the people through this medium, you must do so on our terms and in the way we think best"? I think not.

For what is at stake in a repeal is something much larger than the future of broadcast journalism. It goes to the very heart of the political process in America. And my doubts about the wisdom of the repeal of section 315 do not stem from a low estimate

of the fairness and objectivity of broadcasters. They arise much more out of questions concerning the wisdom of placing that power in the hands of any single group of men.

When the original Radio Act of 1927 was under consideration, a Congressman from Texas proposed a provision which is the direct ancestor of section 315. On the floor of the House he said:

"The power of the press will not be comparable to that of broadcasting stations when the industry is fully developed. If the development continues as rapidly in the future as in the past, it will only be a few years before these broadcasting stations, if operated by chain stations, will simultaneously reach an audience of over half of our entire citizenship, and bring messages to the fireside of nearly every home in America. They can mold and crystallize sentiment as no agency in the past has been able to do. If the strong arm of the law does not prevent monopoly ownership and make discrimination by such stations illegal, American thought and American politics will be largely at the mercy of those who operate these stations. For publicity is the most powerful weapon that can be wielded in a republic."

Let me note in passing that, for the founder of a "discredited relic" of bygone times, this gentleman displayed a good deal of foresight. We do not have monopoly ownership today in American broadcasting. But, in television ownership we have a high concentration of ownership. For practical purposes, three network organizations create or control the great bulk of all the programming appearing on American television screens. For purposes of national political campaigns, the decisions of one official at each network may be critical.

Consider these facts: The largest 50 television markets include almost three-quarters of all the television-equipped homes in the Nation. While those homes are served by 171 television stations, the stations are owned by only 75 separate owners. The largest 10 television markets include some 40 percent of the country's television homes. They are served by 42 stations with only 21 separate owners. Only 9 organizations own 30 of those stations. I repeat—9 organizations control three-quarters of the stations reaching 40 percent of America's television homes. Repeal section 315, let these nine agree to support one presidential candidate, and that candidate is halfway home.

When we speak of repealing the equal-time and no-censorship rules, therefore, we are talking about placing tremendous power in the hands of a relatively few people. One can have the greatest confidence in their character and integrity without wishing to place them under the strains and pressures that would arise—or to place candidates even more rigidly in the position of wooing their favors.

Moreover, complete neutrality and impartiality are neither possible nor desirable in any journalist, including a broadcaster. No one can edit or select without some point of view to guide him. Indeed, partisanship is the essence of journalism. "Throw the rascals out" is the watchword of the classic fighting editor. Harsh words and brash deeds uncover news—and sell newspapers.

What wave of the future do some of our broadcast journalists seek? Is it one that will be ridden by namby-pamby corporate vice presidents, unwilling to dirty their hands with the fighting issues of the day? And would these vice presidents, once freed from the "no censorship" requirement, be willing to allow candidates their usual bluntness and provocative remarks?

The proposal made by some that we replace section 315 with a general requirement of fairness in dealing with candidates seems to me even less acceptable. As I have noted, the Communications Act today imposes a

general requirement that broadcasters be fair—that they allow reasonable opportunities for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance. The FCC has had considerable experience with the administration of this doctrine—enough to teach us that it will not do as a general set of ground rules for broadcasting in political campaigns absent section 315.

In the extraordinary pressure of a campaign, the broadcaster needs to know his obligations and the candidate needs to know his rights. Neither can wait for the resolution of numerous philosophical disputes or engage in extended investigations and discussions. Both must plan. And they cannot be constantly asking the FCC to resolve questions of what is fair and reasonable at the height of an intense campaign.

In any event, broadcasters now have, in substantial measure, the journalistic freedom for which they cry. In 1959 Congress exempted from the equal time rule newscasts, news interviews, news documentaries, and on-the-spot coverage of bona fide news events. These include such programs as "Issues and Answers," "Meet the Press," "Face the Nation," etc. They also include regularly scheduled programs of this kind originated by local stations for local candidates. The exemptions also take in local newscasts as well as Huntley and Brinkley, Walter Cronkite, Ron Cochran and others. The list is long indeed.

These exemptions allow full freedom to journalistic in regular newscasts and news interviews. The more broadcast time and effort that goes into journalism of this sort on a day-to-day, week-to-week basis, the more freedom a broadcaster has to journalistic during elections—for more programs will thus fit the exempt categories. Those who provide expanded news coverage in ordinary times—local as well as network—will have expanded elbow room during campaigns.

Admittedly, these exemptions do not solve all problems raised by section 315. But one thing is certain. No system will work if its operators don't want it to work. The exemptions for news programming will not achieve what Congress intended unless broadcasters are willing to use them in the spirit in which they were designed.

We do not advance matters by trying to make section 315 the whipping boy for every real or imaginary problem that crops up during political campaigns. We cannot solve the basic problems of political broadcasting by thinking of them as a struggle between the forces of progressive journalism and a bunch of benighted politicians. Nor can we solve those problems by thinking of them as a fight to prevent nationwide thought control by diabolical broadcasters.

In short, we must reconcile liberty and equality with a generous portion of fraternity.

What we need is a serious, concentrated effort to face up to the specific problems that beset political broadcasting.

My basic position is reform rather than repeal. A sound program of reform, in my judgment, is represented by the following:

1. Leave section 315 unchanged with respect to paid political broadcasts.

In the field of paid political broadcasting, the requirements of equal opportunities and no censorship serve valid and important public purposes. So does the rule that politicians cannot be charged more than advertisers for the same kind of services. None of these requirements causes significant problems. All should be retained.

2. Require minimum votes or signatures for equal opportunities with respect to free time.

In the field of free political broadcasting, the situation is more complex. The existence of splinter groups and fringe candidates, combined with the equal-time requirement, does restrain some broadcasters from granting all the free time to major candidates that

they otherwise might—and the exemptions for news programming do not resolve this problem. But if it is unreasonable to require equal free time for all—major or minor—candidates, why not concentrate upon the source of the difficulty?

One reasonable proposal that has often been made is to require equal opportunities only for candidates of parties that polled a particular percentage of the vote—say 5 percent or more—in the last preceding election for the office in question. To handle major third parties that appear on the scene between elections, it has been suggested that we permit an alternative way of qualifying for equal opportunities—by filing a petition bearing the certified signatures of a minimal number of registered voters.

Of course, this proposal has limitations. The rare occasions on which a petition procedure might be necessary could pose some administrative problems. In addition, the proposal could not be applied to primary elections, to the nominating process generally, or perhaps to certain kinds of local, nonpartisan elections. It would certainly be a step, however, in the right direction.

Why shouldn't we apply such a proposal to all free political broadcasts that are not already exempt from the "equal-time" rule? To a large extent, we would resolve the problem of fringe candidates without stripping from the major contenders for office the protections that section 315 now gives them.

3. Insure some free time for minority parties and minority candidates.

Some sacrifice of the principle of equality is necessary if we are to progress at all in achieving other goals. No one who treasures free speech, however, can consent to a blanket silencing of minority voices, simply because they are, at a particular point in time, in the minority. Broadcasters have generally expressed their desire to give some free time to such candidates, if they are once relieved of the obligation to give them equal time. I believe that the great majority of broadcasters will do this. If they do not, there is ample protection for the lesser candidates in the general provisions of the Communications Act.

As I have indicated, broadcasters are now required generally to afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance. In the limited sphere involved, I believe that the FCC can reasonably be expected to administer this matter under its fairness doctrine so as to assure reasonable treatment for minority candidates.

4. Require broadcasters to grant free time to major candidates—in an amount equal to time sold—for use as the candidates see fit.

Resolving the problem of fringe candidates will help to produce more free political broadcasting. The television networks have demonstrated their eagerness to provide free time for the presidential race, if they can avoid the minority candidate problem. The fate of free time at the hands of other broadcasters and in other races, however, is much more doubtful.

In the 1962 senatorial campaigns, there were 28 States in which there were only 2 candidates and 8 States in which there were 3 or more. Stations which did not face the problem of minority candidates did not give appreciably more free time to senatorial candidates than stations which did have to consider minority candidates. Nor were there proportionately more stations giving free time to senatorial candidates in the States where there were no minority candidates.

The presidential campaign is unquestionably the most important and the most dramatic of all. But the problem of campaign costs is not limited to campaigns for the Presidency. In many respects, it is deeper—

and its effects more to be feared—in campaigns for lesser offices. If we are seriously intent upon reducing the costs of political campaigning in this country, to secure more free time for the presidential campaign alone is merely to attack the top of the iceberg.

I would therefore advance a suggestion I first made some time ago—that we require a broadcaster to offer, at a minimum an equal amount of free time for each hour of time sold. Time would continue to be sold candidates individually; but when a major candidate purchased time an equal amount of free time would then be afforded for the use of all the qualifying major candidates in that race.

For example, suppose that candidates A, B, and C are contenders for the same office. Candidates A and B are major candidates; candidate C does not meet the 5-percent test. Candidate A buys a total of one-half hour of time from a particular broadcaster. The broadcaster would then be required to offer one-half hour to the major candidates in the race, so that A and B would each receive 15 minutes free. Each time any candidate purchased time, the same result would follow.

This plan has many benefits. It would assure all major candidates some free time. This time would be allocated equally among them, and could be used as they saw fit—for debates, discussions, or separate broadcasts. The decision as to the total time, free and paid, to be devoted to any particular race would be left right where it should be—with the broadcaster. And the plan would apply, without a complicated formula, to a wide range of races.

This proposal would not apply, of course, to races where the proposal to eliminate fringe candidates from the equal opportunities provision is not feasible. Moreover, to avoid problems of last-minute changes in the plans of candidates and to give the broadcaster an opportunity to plan his schedule, we could insert a reasonable cut-off date, eliminating the free-time-for-paid-time requirement for, say, the last week in any campaign.

I recognize that the result would affect broadcasters' earnings—particularly the smaller stations. So I think it reasonable to consider ways in which the general public might assume a portion of that burden. For the people have as great a stake here as the broadcaster.

One solution would be to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit broadcasters to deduct from their taxable income not only the out-of-pocket costs of free political broadcasts (which are now deductible) but some portion of the profits which are thereby sacrificed. The objection to this proposal lies in the complexities it would introduce into our tax laws—both in the mere introduction of another special deduction, and in the calculation of its appropriate amount—at a time when great efforts are being made to simplify and streamline those laws. If these problems can be overcome, however, the proposal has, to my mind, great merit.

In summary, while we cannot afford to jettison the present law, neither can we afford to stand still. At stake here are the basic lines of communication between the citizen and those who seek the responsibilities and power of public office—indeed, the very essence of a self-governing society.

#### THE GAINESVILLE (FLA.) VA HOSPITAL

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, for about 20 years the citizens of Gainesville, Fla., in my congressional district, and our veterans organizations throughout the country, have been working on needed VA hospital facilities across the Nation. We were told many years ago that we would have no hope of obtaining a Veterans' Administration hospital in Gainesville, Fla., unless we had a medical school, because it was the policy of the Veterans' Administration to build new hospitals by medical schools or in areas where doctor personnel and technicians so vital for the care of veterans could be available. The people of Gainesville, and many other interested citizens in the State, realizing that Florida needed a medical school, as well as more veterans hospitals because of our tremendously expanding population, were able after years of effort to get a great medical school on the campus of the University of Florida at Gainesville.

Several years ago, with the cooperation of our House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the Director of our Veterans' Administration, the veterans organizations, and others interested in the proper hospital care of veterans, we at last were rewarded by commitments from Mr. John S. Gleason, Jr., the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, President Kennedy, and later President Johnson, that our Veterans' Administration hospital adjacent to our medical school at the University of Florida would be built.

This much-needed Veterans' Administration hospital is being built according to schedule and we in Florida are most grateful for the efforts being made by the Veterans' Administration to give us this long-needed facility in Florida. Naturally, I was concerned when I read about the closing of certain veterans hospitals and I took the privilege of writing the Honorable W. J. Driver, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, about the status of our Gainesville VA hospital. For the record, I am delighted to enclose a copy of my letter to Mr. Driver, and a copy of his reply to me:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., February 23, 1965.

HON. WILLIAM J. DRIVER,  
Administrator of Veterans Affairs,  
Veterans' Administration  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: I have noticed with interest the announced closing of certain Veterans' Administration hospitals across the country and, as you know, after many years of effort we are now in the process of constructing the new hospital at Gainesville, Fla., in my congressional district. I want to thank you for the personal attention you have given this project which is most meritorious in view of the greatly increased veterans' population in Florida.

Will you please advise me if the closing of other hospitals will in any way have an adverse effect on our Gainesville hospital or whether construction now under way will be abated.

With kindest personal regards, I am,  
Sincerely,

D. R. MATTHEWS,  
Member of Congress.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1965.

Hon. D. R. MATTHEWS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MATTHEWS: I appreciate your thoughtful inquiry concerning the plans of the Veterans' Administration for the Gainesville Veterans' Administration hospital, particularly since I feel that all who share your concern that we continue to maintain a healthy, vigorous, and effective program of veterans medicine should know of the philosophy behind the hospital construction program currently being undertaken by the Veterans' Administration.

The essence of this philosophy can be simply stated: Just as a recent decision of the U.S. Supreme Court indicated that representation in State legislatures should be based not on trees or acres, but on people, the deployment of the medical resources of the Veterans' Administration should be based on its ability to aid the maximum number of sick and disabled veterans with the maximum effectiveness, and not on any extraneous considerations.

The medical program of the Veterans' Administration looms large in America's total medical effort. For example, it employs approximately 4 percent of the Nation's physicians; and 15,000 of the Nation's nurses. The Veterans' Administration is the Nation's largest single employer of a number of medically oriented or medically allied professions, including clinical and counseling psychologists, dietitians, medical and psychiatric social workers, physical therapists, and occupational therapists. It contains almost 8 percent of the Nation's hospital beds. And, it has actually spent since 1950 the sum of \$1,040 million on hospital construction or renovation, and is presently engaged in an additional \$645 million worth of hospital construction.

Medical facilities and personnel are, of course, in critically short supply nationally. Therefore, any organization such as the Veterans' Administration that controls a significant proportion of such facilities and personnel bears the heavy responsibility, in fact the moral duty, of employing them to their maximum potential. Certainly, beds cannot be permitted to lie comparatively fallow in some areas, while others, such as the States of Florida, California, and Arizona, suffer as a result of an inordinate shortage of VA hospital beds.

I believe this preamble points to the obvious reply to your letter: that the decision to close hospitals in other parts of the country will have absolutely no adverse effect on new hospitals planned for Florida, and this most definitely includes construction at the Gainesville hospital, which will go forward at optimum speed. In fact, since the VA operates within a ceiling of 125,000 beds, the closing of marginal hospitals in other parts of the country will simply permit us to transfer capacity to areas such as Florida which have insufficient beds.

Finally, I hope that you will feel free at any time to inquire about the progress of the Gainesville hospital or on other matters affecting your constituents.

Sincerely,

W. J. DRIVER,  
Administrator.

#### VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS DEMOCRACY CONTEST

MR. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

MR. SISK. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year over 250,000 high school students participated in the contest competing for the four scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes.

The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., for the final judging as guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. The winning contestant from the golden State of California is a very gifted young lady, Miss Sandra Peterson of Kerman, Calif., which I am happy to say is in my congressional district.

Miss Peterson uses the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea as a unique illustration to emphasize the obligations and responsibilities, as well as the privileges of citizenship. For the benefit of my colleagues, I should like to include Miss Peterson's timely and inspiring speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

#### THE CHALLENGE OF CITIZENSHIP

(By Sandra Peterson, 1964-65)

There are two seas in Palestine which have endured since the beginning of recorded time. One, the Sea of Galilee, is fresh water with multitudes of fish cavorting happily in its depths. Great splashes of green adorn its banks.

The River Jordan which mothers this sea flows south to still another body of water. Here, there is no sign of lively fish, no fluttering leaf, no song of birds. Here, at the Dead Sea, the air hangs heavy with an atmosphere of death and decay.

What constitutes this vast difference between the two bodies of water? Certainly not the water of the Jordan River, for it conveys a perpetual supply of fresh, sparkling water into both seas.

The difference is that in the Sea of Galilee, for every drop that flows in, another drop flows out. But in the Dead Sea, every drop that enters, remains stagnant, heavy, lifeless.

We may regard citizenship in these terms also; for there are basically two kinds of citizens. There are those who take not only the multitude of privileges which are afforded to a citizen, but also the multitude of responsibilities that citizens can contribute to the progress of their country. There are those who work toward furthering their ideals and principles, and who accept the supreme responsibility of every man to be true to himself.

The great book of history is filled with the dust and ashes of empires that were lost when the virtue of their citizens was lost. Unless citizens give of their vitality and their energy, of their thoughts and their ideals, of a great measure of themselves to their country, the citizens within the country and the country itself become stagnant, heavy, lifeless.

Unfortunately there are many citizens who are content to just sit back and take, but who make no effort to give. How many people complain about the outcome of an election but fail to vote? How many people enjoy the human rights for which this country was founded but deny their black brother these same rights, or contribute to this denial by apathy or silence? How many people fail to develop new ideas because they fear that they might not be accepted or because they become apathetic when the development of these ideas involves a little

work? These are the citizens who slowly contribute to the stagnation of their country, to the stagnation of their ideals, and to the stagnation of themselves.

Perhaps the main reason for a citizen's shunning his responsibility is his feeling of smallness; his feeling that he is only one in a land of many; his feeling that his opinion doesn't matter; his feeling that he can't shake the world with a new discovery in science or administer a perfect plan for peace.

Perhaps this man will never do anything of world renown, but it is important that he do the best he can do. A country can have life and vitality, only if the citizens within it have life and vitality.

One small spark can light a candle. This candle may give only a dim light by itself, yet, if every home in every hamlet, in every town, and in every city would put a candle in the window, the brilliance of that one, little spark would be magnified a thousand-fold.

Each individual has the responsibility of being true to his country, by first being true to himself. This is the challenge of citizenship.

Perhaps this is what an unknown author tried to tell us when he wrote:

"I am only one  
But, I am one.  
I cannot do everything,  
But, I can do something.  
What I can do, I ought to do;  
And what I ought to do,  
By the grace of God  
I will do."

If you and if I make a true effort, if each individual gives of himself, ours will not become a stagnant sea.

#### THE CRISIS IN SELMA, ALA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

MR. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

MR. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the subject of this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MR. CONYERS. My fellow colleagues, everyone here in this Hall has been deeply disturbed by the calamitous events that have occurred in Selma, Ala., and, indeed, in the State of Alabama since last Sunday. I am sure that we all share the shock and deep revulsion that the violence and brutality which has been visited upon Negro American citizens has caused all of us to feel. We are now at a time of crisis which the Federal Government can no longer ignore.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to meet with the Vice President and the Attorney General twice in the last 48 hours. I have been flooded by telegrams

from my congressional district in Detroit. I have even present here in Washington, D.C., a number of ministers and community leaders from Detroit, both Negro and white, who share my view that the time has come when we in the Federal Government, not only the President, not only the Attorney General, but the Congress of the United States must act and act with dispatch.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to read to the Members of the House a telegram that is at this moment being circulated for Members to join with me in sending to our President. It reads as follows:

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
President of the United States,  
The White House, Washington, D.C.:

We Members of the House of Representatives urge you to use the full powers of your office to prevent further violence in Selma, Ala., against Negro Americans striving to gain their right to register and vote who are relying on the first amendment's guarantee of "the right of the people peaceably to assemble and petition the Government for redress of grievances."

We feel that local law and order has broken down in Selma, Ala., just as it did in Little Rock, Ark., on September 24, 1957, Oxford, Miss., on September 30, 1962, and various Alabama communities on June 11 and September 10, 1963, when two of your predecessors, one a Democrat and one a Republican, relied on their powers under sections 332, 333, 334, title 10, United States Code, to suppress domestic violence, unlawful combinations, and conspiracies depriving American citizens of rights secured to them by the U.S. Constitution and Federal law.

The disgraceful and arbitrary exercise of the State police powers in Selma, Ala., on Sunday, March 8, 1965, dramatically demonstrated that State and local officials not only permitted but participated in an illegal and brutal suppression of a peaceful assembly by Negro citizens protesting the denial of their right to vote.

We feel confident that you will utilize all the resources of your office, both moral suasion and any Federal troops or marshals that might be needed, to remedy the violations of the Bill of Rights in Selma, Ala.

We further urge you to endorse additional legislation which will provide Federal remedies to those citizens of Alabama and elsewhere in America who are being denied their right to vote by discriminatory and arbitrary methods.

Mr. Speaker, there is at least a twofold constitutional violation involved in the recent events in Alabama. Not only is the constitutionally guaranteed right to vote being denied. In addition we have witnessed the flagrant violations in Selma, Ala., of the first amendment guarantees of the right to picket, the right to peaceful assembly, the right to free speech, and the right to petition for a redress of grievances. Repeated court decisions have established the very broad and definite protection secured by the first amendment. Surely there can be little doubt that Sunday's events in Selma were a denial of those first amendment guarantees.

I have had reports this afternoon that planes are not being permitted to land in Montgomery, Ala., the closest airstop to Selma, but are being forced to land in other areas. This seems to be a very blatant attempt to prevent the arrival in Selma of the hundreds upon hundreds

of ministers and leaders, both white and Negro, from all over this country, who want to give witness to their deep concern over the crisis now confronting us.

There is no doubt in my mind that if the President of the United States and the Attorney General and the entire Federal Government do not act with dispatch and with courage, that American history will continue to tell the story of violence inflicted upon American citizens striving to secure their right to vote.

Do we not in the National Government of the most powerful country in the world have the intelligence, courage, and insight to insure that future American history books can say that finally in 1965 all Americans gained the right to vote without repeated bloody struggles in one southern town after the next?

I feel that the Attorney General has that necessary insight and ability. May I say that I have the deepest respect for both the legal abilities and the deep commitment of Nicholas Katzenbach to the sacred dignity of the individual.

Certainly Lyndon Johnson has demonstrated his great powers of leadership and that he has the overwhelming confidence and support of the American people. The President's state of the Union and inaugural addresses were eloquent and moving statements of the American dream of equal dignity for all men.

There is no doubt that the overwhelming majority of the American people—in all regions of this country—agree that every American must be secure in his right to vote.

I have taken this special order today so that everyone who shares this concern could join together in urging on the executive branch the necessity to act—and to act immediately—that this crisis requires. If we do not act now, I am fearful of what tomorrow's headlines will tell.

Already we have seen the terrible film clips dramatically showing the situation in Selma. All America, indeed the entire world, has been disturbed, by this great brutality and unfairness that continues daily.

Certainly it is tragic irony that during the same weeks that our Government felt it necessary to act with such vigor and dispatch to defend the freedom of those in distant lands, that yet we find a reluctance and inability to defend the liberty of American citizens who are only a few hundred miles from Washington.

I join in the great dread and reluctance to use Federal troops. But I would hope that every American would also join in the great responsibility upon us all to end this repeated violence so that Federal force is not necessary. But if it is necessary, we should use whatever Federal troops are required to guarantee that not one single additional American will lose his life or suffer grave bodily harm in Alabama because of wanton violence perpetrated by duly constituted law enforcement officers. The phrase "peace officer" has a ring of mockery today in Selma, Ala.

But it is not only the State and local governments nor just the executive

branch that have a responsibility in this situation. The U.S. Congress has its own special duty.

We must immediately declare by Federal law that the U.S. Government will no longer tolerate any further interference with the right to vote. We should authorize the appointment of Federal voting registrars in areas where the local officials are either unable or unwilling to apply the same registration procedures to both whites and Negroes. We need to abolish literacy tests where they are being used to arbitrarily deny the right to vote. Certainly such additional Federal legislation must apply to State and local elections as did the Civil Rights Acts of 1957 and 1960. If last Sunday's events in Selma demonstrate nothing, they showed to the country that it is at the State and local levels of government that the American principles of "consent of the governed" and "equal protection of the laws" is most flagrantly being denied. The No. 1 need in so many of our Southern communities is sheriffs who not only do not themselves participate in unlawful violence against Negro Americans but who actually help enforce the laws.

Though a strong and definite Federal voting registrar law is immediately needed, it seems to me that there is a further urgent task the Congress must address itself to. Just the passage of a Federal voting registrar bill will not necessarily halt the unrestrained violence against Negroes that has so long plagued the South. We must pass very clear and definite Federal laws that provide undisputed Federal authority to guarantee the equal protection of the laws when local law enforcement has broken down. As I stated in the telegram that I read, I feel that section 333, title 10, of the United States Code, already provides that authority. But I feel that we should pass additional legislation which will state that authority in such clear terms that there will be neither hesitation nor doubt in future times if such events occur again.

Mr. Speaker, I have never been quite moved to this extent before. I feel that I must begin from this moment on to repledge myself to move with every power in my command in urging every American to join with me in agreeing on this one simple goal. Now is the time for once and for all in America's history to make this a country in which the constitutional rights of the smallest and most insignificant American will be felt and regarded with the greatest honor.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have inserted into the RECORD immediately following my remarks, some telegrams and editorials which demonstrate the reason, restraint, and sincerity of the many prominent people and organizations throughout the country that are urging the President to act in this crisis without further delay.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have inserted into the RECORD the text of section 333, title 10, United States Code.

This telegram was sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson on March 9, 1965, from the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights. This group embraces all the

very many groups, including the churches and the labor unions, who are actively involved in the civil rights struggle:

We urge the maximum use of Federal power to prevent further violence and to protect constitutional rights in Selma, Ala. We are outraged by the brutal, illegal suppression of the civil rights of American citizens in Alabama by the State and by the local governments of that area. We are confident you will utilize the full powers of your office to provide such additional Federal presence as will prevent further bloodshed in Alabama and the continued violation of the constitutional rights of the citizens of that State.

We further urge you to send immediately to the Congress legislation which will guarantee full voting rights to the harassed citizens of Selma and of every other county and State where American citizens are prevented from the free exercise of their right to register and to vote.

A telegram sent this noon to President Johnson by all the members of the Michigan congressional delegation, both Democrats and Republicans:

The following members of the Michigan delegation to Congress notify you of their support for the following statement issued by the Civil Rights Leadership Conference on Protection of Demonstrators in Selma, Ala.

We urge the maximum use of Federal power to prevent further violence and to protect constitutional rights in Selma, Ala. We are outraged by the brutal, illegal suppression of the civil rights of American citizens in Alabama by the State and by the local governments of that area. We are confident you will utilize the full powers of your office to provide such additional Federal presence as will prevent further bloodshed in Alabama and the continued violation of the constitutional rights of the citizens of that State.

We further urge you to send immediately to the Congress legislation which will guarantee full voting rights to the harassed citizens of Selma and of every other county and State where American citizens are prevented from the free exercise of their right to register and to vote.

The signers were: Senators PAT MCNAMARA, Democrat, and PHILIP A. HART, Democrat; Democratic Representatives RAYMOND F. CLEVINGER, JOHN CONYERS, JR., CHARLES C. DIGGS, JOHN D. DINGELL, BILLIE S. FARNUM, WILLIAM D. FORD, MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, JOHN C. MACKIE, LUCIEN N. NEDZI, JAMES G. O'HARA, PAUL H. TODD, JR., WESTON E. VIVIAN; and Republican Representatives WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD, ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, GERALD R. FORD, ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, JAMES HARVEY, and EDWARD HUTCHINSON.

A telegram sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson today by Mr. Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers of America:

Americans of all religious faiths, of all political persuasions, and from every section of our Nation are deeply shocked and outraged at the tragic events in Selma, Ala., and they look to the Federal Government as the only possible source to protect and guarantee the exercise of constitutional rights, which is being denied and destroyed by the Dallas County law enforcement agents and the Alabama State troops under the direction of Governor George Wallace.

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, I join in urging you to take immediate and appropriate steps including the use of Federal marshals and troops if necessary, so

that the full exercise of constitutional rights including free assembly and free speech may be fully protected.

Sunday's spectacle of tear gas and night sticks, whips, and electric cattle prods used against defenseless citizens demonstrating to secure their constitutional right to register and vote as American citizens was an outrage against all decency. This shameful brutality by law-enforcing agents makes a mockery of Americans' concepts of justice and provides effective ammunition to Communist propaganda and our enemies around the world who would weaken and destroy us.

Mr. President, your prompt and decisive leadership in this crisis is imperative in demonstrating Americans' fundamental allegiance to the constitutional rights of all citizens. Prompt and decisive action on your part will moreover discourage the apostles of hatred, bigotry, and violence, who would divide America. It will give great encouragement and added strength to the many Americans in the South who, like you and the vast majority of Americans, believe that every citizen has a moral and constitutional right to register and vote.

I am confident that in this crisis, Mr. President, you will act with the same conviction, courage, and compassion which has characterized your leadership and other periods of challenge.

A telegram sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson on March 8, 1965, by Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., national vice chairman of Americans for Democratic Action.

PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.:

Events in Selma have shocked entire Nation and far worse is threatened tomorrow. We plead with you to take prompt action. First, we urge that Federal marshals or troops protect marchers exercising their constitutional right of protest in Selma tomorrow. Second, we urge that voting registrar bill be sent to Congress immediately so that Alabama Negroes will know that help is coming. Without minimizing complexity of situation we must respectfully suggest that the absence of action now will bring further violence to the detriment of our Nation around the world.

JOSEPH L. RAUH, JR.,  
Vice Chairman, Americans for Democratic Action.

An editorial from the morning's edition of the New York Times:

#### INCIDENT AT SELMA

The "bloody Sunday" in Selma, Ala., brings the moral and legal issues in that State once again to a point of crisis.

The right of citizens to assemble peacefully and to petition their elected officials for redress of their grievances is as old as free government and as plain as the Declaration of Independence. The State of Alabama has the responsibility to protect its citizens, both Negro and white, in the exercise of that right.

Gov. George C. Wallace has instead chosen to meet peaceful protest with armed force. By authorizing State troopers, sheriff's deputies and members of a volunteer posse to attack a group of private citizens, he has written another shameful page in his own record and in the history of Alabama.

The scene in Selma resembled that in a police state. Heavily armed men attacked the marchers. "The first ten or twenty Negroes were swept to the ground screaming, arms and legs flying." Tear gas was used. "Fifteen or twenty nightsticks could be seen through the gas, flailing at the heads of the marchers." The hurried rout went on. "Four or five women lay on the grass strip where the troopers had knocked them down." Witnesses "said they saw posmen using

whips on the fleeing Negroes as they recrossed the bridge."

If this is described as law enforcement, it is misnamed. It is nothing more nor less than race-conscious officialdom run amuck. It disgraces not only the State of Alabama but every citizen of the country in which it can happen.

An editorial from this morning's edition of the Washington Post:

#### OUTRAGE AT SELMA

The news from Selma, Ala., where police beat and mauled and gassed unarmed, helpless and unoffending citizens will shock and alarm the whole Nation. It is simply inconceivable that in this day and age, the police who have sworn to uphold the law and protect the citizenry could resort, instead, to violent attacks upon them.

Decent citizens will weep for the wronged and persecuted demonstrators, for the decent citizens of Alabama who must recoil in horror from the spectacle of sadism, for the good name of the Nation before the world. This brutality is the inevitable result of the intolerance fostered by an infamous State government that is without conscience or morals.

The situation calls for more than mere reproach and anguish, but it is not easy to say what can be done to prevent the repetition of this scandalous misuse of police power. Congress, as a beginning, must promptly pass legislation that will put into Federal hands the registration of voters that the Alabama authorities will continue to obstruct as long as they have any discretion. At least, such legislation will put beyond contest the rights that the Negro citizens have been trying to gain by demonstration.

The text of section 33, title 10, United States Code:

#### INTERFERENCE WITH STATE AND FEDERAL LAW

The President, by using the militia or the armed forces, or both, or by any other means, shall take such measures as he considers necessary to suppress, in a State, any insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combination, or conspiracy, if it—

(1) so hinders the execution of the laws of that State, and of the United States within the State, that any part or class of its people is deprived of a right, privilege, immunity, or protection named in the Constitution and secured by law, and the constituted authorities of that State are unable, fail, or refuse to protect that right, privilege, or immunity, or to give that protection; or

(2) opposes or obstructs the execution of the laws of the United States or impedes the course of justice under those laws. In any situation covered by clause (1), the State shall be considered to have denied the equal protection of the laws secured by the Constitution.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a great sense of shame for our country. At a time when we are sending marines into South Vietnam to protect that country from the night of dictatorship, we have a tyrant in our own country willing to use the most brutal means to deny citizens the right to vote. It is shocking and humiliating and can no longer be tolerated. There is no reasonable conclusion other than that the vicious brutality of the

police in Selma was undertaken by orders of the Governor. If this is not true, the Governor should say so. If he cannot control the actions of his own police officers, he should ask for Federal help. Governor Wallace is an attorney and he knows that citizens have a right to demonstrate peacefully. He has apparently chosen to insult and to provoke the U.S. Government. If he continues to govern his State as though it were a private barony where the writ of the Constitution does not extend, he must be taught by this Government that the State of Alabama is one of the 50 States. He must be taught that the U.S. Government will protect its citizens in the State of Alabama in the exercise of those rights which this Government guarantees.

I understand that the Governor was up most of last night. I hope in those night hours he felt some shame for what he had done. If no shame visited him then I hope, at least, that he realized that this country will not tolerate flagrant contempt of the law and the Constitution by any person even though he be a Governor. Before I conclude these brief remarks, I would like to commend the Reverend Martin Luther King, the courageous Americans of Negro descent of Alabama, the members of the clergy and the other brave people who have journeyed to Selma today to make common cause with their fellow citizens.

I have been in Mississippi and I have been in Selma, Ala., and I know there are many white people in the South who do not believe as I do about the equal worth of all people. I do not ask George Wallace to believe as I do but I think this body can do no less than demand of him that he respect the laws of this country.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO].

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in protesting against the indignities and brutalities being heaped upon American citizens by other American citizens in Alabama. It is almost unbelievable that this kind of treatment can be meted out today, upon the orders of a State Governor. The bullwhips and clubs smack of the days of slavery, and every American citizen should feel shame that his fellow man is capable of doing what has been done and, apparently, what will be continued in Alabama unless immediate and forceful action is taken by the Federal Government.

The Constitution of the United States guarantees to every American citizen the same rights—no distinction is made between races, religions, or creeds. It is our duty to insure that every citizen may exercise his privileges of citizenship without fear of or actually experiencing bodily harm. The Negroes of Selma, Ala., have chosen to exercise the privilege of registering to vote, and the State powers that be have chosen to deny that right at any cost. Not only is the individual Negro citizen in Alabama suffering but the image of the United States is suffering at home and abroad.

In my opinion, when protection of the law is denied by a State or subdivision

thereof, then it becomes the duty of the United States to step in and protect the citizenry. The police power in the State of Alabama has been turned against its citizens because these citizens choose to exercise their constitutional rights—they must be protected.

It is crystal-clear that, under the present system, the right to vote will be denied the vast majority of the Negro citizens of Alabama, regardless of their education, intelligence, and so forth. This is true also for many other areas in this Nation. Additional legislation is the answer and the only answer. I am a cosponsor, in this Congress, of a bill to further secure the right to vote, free from discrimination on account of race or color, through the establishment of a Federal Voting, Registration, and Elections Commission. Obviously, this legislation is essential, and I call upon my colleagues to get on with the job without further delay.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON].

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] on his remarks this afternoon and express my desire to join with him in the telegram that he referred to and also join with him in his call for new legislation. I think the situation in Alabama is a disgrace to the country. We must move now, not only with telegrams and with legislation. I feel personally very strongly that there must also be real Federal intervention in Alabama. There is a real question whether a Republican form of government exists in Alabama and under the Constitution clearly the Federal Government has a right to protect law and order in a State where conditions of that sort exist.

I think the gentleman made a very significant point in saying merely to pass new laws will not suffice to meet this problem. There must also be some enforcement of these laws, and this is what we do not have today in Alabama. We passed a law last year in the civil rights bill. But there has been foot dragging and evasion of that law. Even if we had a Federal registrar bill enacted into law today or tomorrow, there would still be efforts to drag feet on that kind of legislation in Alabama. That is why I say we do need a Federal presence there, so as to insure that the laws we pass here are carried out equally in every one of the 50 States of the Union.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan and to compliment him for the position he has taken in the House today. I also would like to indicate that I agree to associate

myself with the telegram he plans to send to the President of the United States. I hope other colleagues will join with him.

Mr. Speaker, as the House of Representatives meets today, our country faces a challenge to the democratic process. The challenge has been issued by those who defy the constitutional rights of Negro citizens in Selma, Ala., and other cities in the United States. At this hour, ministers, priests, rabbis, doctors, and others have joined the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King in the 50-mile protest march from Selma to the State capitol at Montgomery, Ala.

It is fitting that in this Chamber of democracy in action, Representatives have expressed their concern for the protection and safety of those who have chosen to march in protest against the bloody and inhumane assaults which have occurred in Selma. The incidents of yesterday were shocking, disgraceful, and incompatible with the ideals of a civilized society. Tear gas, whips, and clubs have been commonplace and their use is reported in our newspapers with a frequency which is befitting a totalitarian state.

The Federal Government's responsibility is quite clear—when the people of any State resort to lawlessness and State and local officials fail to maintain law and order, the Federal Government must meet that responsibility quickly and forcefully. What is at stake is not the respective races—but our Nation. As decent Americans, yes, as decent human beings, with our deeply rooted religious faith, we must continue the fight against prejudice and discrimination. We must not waver in our commitment to achieve human rights for every American citizen.

I have always believed that the civil rights problem was not confined to the cry for justice from 20 million Americans who happen to be Negro.

Partly due to the fact that an understanding of civil rights involves some knowledge of constitutional law, there is a good deal of confusion as to what the term "civil rights" means.

The law dictionary defines the term "civil rights" as the "rights of citizenship," which we can readily agree is too narrow a definition. Actually, a better definition would be "federally protected rights" for they are the rights protected by our Federal Constitution and guaranteed to all persons. Indeed, the 14th amendment was adopted to reverse the ruling in the Dred Scott decision which held that Negroes were not citizens.

The cry for justice has been loud and long and frequently voiced in pursuit of the rights of man—the rights of citizens under the supreme law of the land—and against man's inhumanity to man.

I do not know when I first heard the cry for justice, but I heard it a long time ago when I was a young boy on the lower east side of New York. From the pages of my history books in school I heard the cry for justice of the colonists against the tyranny of the Kings of England—to which Thomas Jefferson responded with the Declaration of Independence.

I heard the cry for justice from the Negro slaves through the first half of the 19th century—to which Abraham Lincoln responded with the Emancipation Proclamation.

"Give me your tired, your tempest torn, yearning to be free," is the answer engraved on the Statue of Liberty to the cries for justice which came from overseas. We opened wide our gates—first came the Irish after the potato famine in the middle of the century; then the Germans, the Italians, the Greeks, the Central Europeans, and, at the turn of the century, the Jews came following the pogroms in Russia. Each group in turn was heard to cry for justice because of bias, prejudice, and a violation of their civil rights.

I heard the cry for justice from the sweatshop worker when I was a teenager, and I heard the cry for justice of the clerks in the 5-and-10-cent stores who could not afford to buy a 10-cent item out of a weekly salary of \$5 while I attended law school.

What about the cry for justice of the Negro since the Civil War?

The vast majority of all Americans believe that one God created us all and believe in the supreme law of our land—"that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights \* \* \*."

Yet for 100 years laws have been enacted—the Supreme Court has been called upon to interpret them—all because a minority of our people refuse to accept the mandate of our Constitution and have not yet heard the cry for justice.

The cry for justice from Selma, Ala., is loud and clear.

In the State of Alabama not only the divine law but also the supreme law of the land is perverted into a device for repression and terror. Because this perversion threatens each of us, the struggle for human rights in Selma is the only defense for the preservation of human rights everywhere.

That is why what is happening in the State of Alabama is both shocking and tragic, and of vital concern to every American—in the North, in the West, in the East, and in the South. In Alabama, in the true traditions of a fascist state, the law becomes an instrument to aid the lawbreaker in injuring the law abider. What does an Alabama official or law-enforcement officer mean when he appeals for law and order?

Our civil rights are the lifeblood of our freedom. A denial of a civil right is a curtailment of a freedom. That is why I call upon all citizens who value their freedom—who value their constitutional rights—to listen to the cry for justice from Selma, Ala.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the archives of the civil rights movements are already filled with reports of violent days and brutal nights. All too well we know of murders and beatings and the hate that brings them about. But to know this story is not to become used to it. To be aware of past tragedy is not to become insensitive to present chaos. Each time men are brutally punished in

their courageous quest for freedom and justice, we must respond with undiminished outrage. And so it should be with recent events in Selma, Ala.

The exercise of terror on Sunday violates our conscience and offends our ideals. But it should not dampen our spirits. At this very moment, men and women and children who were beaten and bruised and whipped are rising again and marching again. I think we would all do well to pause and reflect on the courage of such action. If spirit can persevere under these conditions, then surely there is great hope in this Republic.

But there is pain and dishonor as well. And it cannot go unacknowledged. We can be sympathetic bystanders to the crowds whose courageous actions uplift us all. But we cannot be bystanders to the violence and brutality that is inflicted upon them.

If we cannot ourselves march to Montgomery, we can express our spirit of community with those who do. There are many ways for us to do so.

One such way, of course, is by our statements here in the House—the forum of democracy. Another way—far more important because it is far more effective—would be the passage of strong legislation to end all voting discrimination. Such legislation must be passed now, and without any delay. And, most certainly, without any compromises to those forces who are brutalizing our citizens and shaming our democracy. As a lawyer, I can understand the importance of care and prudence in drafting legislation. We must make sure there are no loopholes which will be seized by those who seek to thwart our purpose. But as a citizen and a Member of Congress I must register my strongest desire for swift action, here and now.

Still another expression of our support can come in the area of protection. Those who are literally putting their lives on the line can look at us and say, "Thank you for your kind words, but we are being whipped and gassed. Words are not helping us much." Well, we have to answer that argument. And I think we must be prepared to urge the executive branch to consider offering Federal protection against an all too likely repetition of the violence and brutality that so shocked us last Sunday. Authority for such action exists—title 10, section 333 of United States Code and section 902 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Beneath the violence and brutality of recent events in Selma, there lies a more permanently disturbing disorder: American citizens are being refused their inherent right to vote. This is intolerable. Those authorities who sanction or even order the violent obstruction of such rights ought to be served notice that their behavior will not be tolerated. Early today I urged that the President close all military establishments in the State of Alabama. Such action is sanctioned by morality and prescribed by justice. It is unreasonable for the Federal Government to bolster the economy and fatten the purses of officials and local governments who disobey our laws and victimize our citizens.

The Congress of the United States must be as vigilant in the protection of civil rights as the marchers are courageous in their quest for freedom. We must consider all necessary measures when they are needed, but preferably before they are needed. We must consider voters' rights legislation. We must consider implementing title 6 of the Civil Rights Act. We must consider measures to reduce representation of those States which deprive some of their citizens of the right to vote.

The civil rights movement cannot really be shifted from the streets to the statutes or from the statutes to the courts. For the civil rights movement occupies all these places at once. Our job in Congress is different from the job of civil rights workers and leaders. But our goals are the same. To meet our obligations, the Congress must be as forthright in its way as those that are whipped and beaten and gassed in Selma. We can do no less and still feel that we are adequately serving this country and its citizens.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT].

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker I am shocked at recent incidents in Selma, Ala. The brutal way that peaceful demonstrations by American citizens were broken up last Sunday once again points out the urgency of the moral and legal issues in Alabama. These Americans, both Negro and white, were exercising their constitutional right to protest injustice. The Governor and other Alabama officials have deliberately created an atmosphere of intimidation and fear in an attempt to discourage the lawful assembly and peaceful expression of their grievances. They have every right to assemble peacefully, and the State of Alabama has the responsibility and moral obligation to provide for their protection.

The use of tear gas, whips, nightsticks, the beating of marchers—these present a shameful picture of a "police state" and it is a disgrace to our whole country.

I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in protesting this outrageous display of racial bigotry and outright deprivation of freedom and constitutional rights. I renew my request for Federal voter registration legislation to end the fraudulent device of the literacy test now being used to prevent American citizens from voting.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Justice Department to use every means at its disposal to protect the rights of the people of Selma. We must act to provide protection to our citizens and to assure them the justice and freedom that is rightfully theirs.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding. Yesterday the newspapers of the Nation—and those of the world—carried photographs and stories of an

event which would do credit to any police state in the world. Although I have long been acquainted with the endless list of brutalities practiced by what is euphemistically termed "law enforcement officers," I could hardly believe my eyes and ears at this latest development in Selma when so-called law enforcement officers terrorized, clubbed, whipped, and tear-gassed unarmed citizens off the public streets and highway. Helmeted, gas masked, mounted ruffians injured and terrorized men and women defenseless in everything except the justice of their cause—and all, under the guise of "preserving the public safety."

I ask, Mr. Speaker, was it preserving the public safety to gas American citizens kneeling in prayer? Was it preserving the public safety to club and whip stumbling and panicked men and women fleeing for the safety of their homes? Was it preserving the public safety to order still other citizens, not participating in the march, off the public streets—simply because their skins were dark? Everyone knows that it was in fact an exercise in oppression. Everyone knows, and yet the Justice Department announces it will investigate—in-vestigate, if you will—whether unnecessary force was used by law officers and others.

Is this the whole authority of the U.S. Government? Is this the whole authority of a Government which can, at one moment, dispatch 3,500 marines to a foreign land, ostensibly to preserve the peace and freedom of a people who have shown a remarkable disinterest in being thus saved, but a Government which cannot, on the other hand, save its own citizens from the tyranny practiced at home? Is this the U.S. Government which dares the armed might of dangerous and powerful enemies abroad, but surrenders to storm troopers armed with tear gas and billy clubs? To say so is an offense against all sense and reason.

Now a man who was recently honored in the capitals of the world—a man whose name will reside in history alongside those of other great men and Nobel Peace Prize winners such as Albert Schweitzer, Lester Pearson, Dag Hammarskjöld, Teddy Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, Ralph Bunche, and innumerable others to whom we pay homage—this American who symbolizes the ideal of America itself—has been forced to express disillusionment in his own Government which claims to be unable to protect its citizens in the exercise of their constitutional rights. It seems to me this brings shame upon all of us.

Two Presidents, in very recent years, have so eloquently proclaimed we will defend freedom in any part of the world.

What is freedom, Mr. Speaker? Is it not, at the very least, the right of the governed to have a voice about those who govern them? Yet citizens of certain of our States are denied not only this, but—now—even the right to protest their "exclusion" from this most sacred democratic process. Can we really say we are helpless to enforce their rights now? If so, are we not then really saying

that the most powerful nation on earth—self-styled defender of freedom around the globe—has abandoned its own citizens to the depredations of backyard despots.

Mr. Speaker, less than 2 years ago the city of Washington accommodated 200,000 citizens gathered to exercise their constitutionally protected right to peaceably assemble and petition their Government for redress of grievances. If the city of Washington and its law enforcement officers can preserve the peace while permitting such a legal assembly of 200,000, why cannot the State of Alabama do the same for less than 1,000—far less, in fact, than one two-hundredths of that 200,000? Are the so-called law enforcement officers of the State of Alabama such that they cannot do for 400 to 600 people what the law enforcement officers of a city did for 200,000? Is not the Alabama Governor saying, in effect, that his State troopers are too inept and bungling to protect a small group of citizens in exercising a constitutional right? If so, does not the Federal Government have a duty and right to send in troops which will, in fact, preserve the public safety?

One of the most disturbing pictures on television and in the press was of an FBI agent at one of the scenes of violence taking pictures. In preceding months and years when similar violence has occurred in Mississippi or Alabama or other places, and requests have been made for action by the FBI, we have been repeatedly told that the FBI is an investigative agency and therefore cannot take action. May I ask, Mr. Speaker, if a FBI agent were at a bank where a robbery was taking place, would he stand by and say we are only an investigative agency and cannot take action? This hardly seems likely.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] has already cited two places in the United States Code and as I understand it there are at least two Federal statutes which authorize a great deal more than "investigation." I refer to sections 241 and 242, title 18, of the United States Code which provide as follows:

If two or more persons conspire to injure, oppress, threaten or intimidate any citizen in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or because of his having so exercised the same . . . they shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years or both.

And—

Whoever, under color of any law, statute, ordinance, regulation, or custom, willfully subjects, or causes to be subjected, any inhabitant of any State, Territory, or District to the deprivation of any rights, privileges or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or to different punishments, pains or penalties, on account of such inhabitant being an alien, or by reason of his color, or race, than are prescribed for the punishment of citizens, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that every Alabama official who participated in

Sunday's revolting episode could be indicted on either or both of these statutes—and without any more evidence necessary than that which the eyes of the whole world have seen.

I would like to join the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS], in the telegram being sent to the President and other requests he has made for action.

Can we be reminded of some of the words which President Kennedy would have given on that fateful November 22 day if he had lived:

It should be clear by now that a nation can be no stronger abroad than she is at home. Only an America which practices what it preaches about equal rights and social justice will be respected by those whose choice affects our future.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the lesson for us in Congress to learn from the tragic events in Selma, Ala., in recent days is that despite our best efforts, the legislation which we have enacted has not been effective in securing the rights of all American citizens.

I am convinced that the President of the United States, the Attorney General, and the leadership of this House are dedicated to the cause of freedom, liberty, and rights of all our citizens.

I am further convinced that the failure of this Congress to secure those rights effectively is one which can be remedied.

It seems to me that the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court rendered yesterday in the Louisiana voting case, combined with a system of Federal voting registrars where needed and other necessary steps to secure rights and to protect our citizens in the exercise of those rights, form the basis for effective legislative action, upon recommendation of the President and with the support of both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and expect that within the next few days we will receive from the President a message on the subject of civil rights and legislation to carry out the objectives which we all must seek.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we should realize that this is an emergency requiring high priority legislation. As important as the special legislative interests of each of us may be, this is more important than any of them. The utmost priority should be given to legislation to protect voting rights. I hope each Member will direct his efforts to carrying out the great objectives set forth in our Bill of Rights.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding and I wish to commend him for his brilliant leadership in the few weeks that he has been in Congress. Further, Mr.

Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which the gentleman has made, including the telegram which he has indicated he will address to the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I, along with others, was indeed shocked when I also saw pictures the other day in the Evening Star, and the one in particular which I think most of us have seen, concerning the brutal treatment by the State troopers of the marchers. At first glance it seemed to me it was something which had occurred in Vietnam. But upon reading the article I discovered that it was something which had occurred in our own country and in a sister State.

Mr. Speaker, it called to my attention some of the statements that were made when some of us were on a recent trip to Selma in which the public officials there were wailing because they said the newspapers were printing only one side of the story and giving only those pictures which indicated brutality on the part of southern law enforcement officials. It occurred to me that in view of the fact there are many very strong southern newspapers and certainly many newspaper reporters and photographers on the staffs of these southern newspapers who are much closer to the situation, it is remarkable that they have not thus far brought one bit of evidence or a photograph which indicates brutality or violence on the part of those individuals fighting for civil rights. Certainly, they have all of the facilities, however, available to them, to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should not forget what the situation is all about at the present time. The facts are very simple. Selma, Ala., is in the center of the so-called "black belt" counties of Alabama. The Negroes in many of these counties outnumber the whites. Yet in this particular county, in Dallas County, where Negroes outnumber the whites, less than 1 percent of its voters are Negroes. Wilcox County, with a 78-percent Negro population, has never had a Negro voter and its power structure brags that it never will. Similar conditions exist in other counties, including Greene, Macon, Hale, Marengo, and many other counties of Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, the issue of literacy has also been raised. This is a false issue on its face. Why should a county with a low literacy rate, a low school effort, require one of the most sophisticated and intellectual voting requirements of any place in the world?

It is also a lie because college graduates, schoolteachers, and professionals cannot pass the tests that they have used in Alabama. This points to the real reason Negroes and poor whites will never become better educated unless Negroes who constitute the majority in these counties become registered and vote for their own school boards, their own city, county, and Federal officials, and especially their own sheriff, whose billy club is more powerful than the FBI and the Constitution in the "black belt."

The right to vote is the key to settling race conflicts in the Deep South. Its denial, by devious techniques, economic

reprisals, harassment, intimidation, and even murder, has led ordinary people to demonstrate and march for their constitutional rights. And there are not enough billy clubs, fire hoses, paddy wagons, and police dogs to stem the tide of good people yearning for freedom and human dignity.

But this is not their fight exclusively. When Big Jim Clark clubbed Mrs. Annie Lee Cooper in the breasts with his billy club he degraded law enforcement in our country and the sanctity of American womanhood.

When Governor Wallace ordered State troopers to gas, beat, and chase American citizens peacefully marching to their State capitol he struck at all of us, our liberties and our security; and he embarrassed our country, pledged as we are to provide the moral leadership for the free peoples of the world.

Able legal minds agree that the 1st and 14th amendments are daily being violated in Alabama. Federal action is not only warranted but if delayed can help to create worse conditions, if such there be. I join others in urging our President, who has the will and capacity, to act. I also urge this Congress to pass a stronger voting law and to proceed in accordance with the Constitution to reduce the congressional representation of Alabama and Mississippi until such time that every citizen in these States is permitted to register.

This is no time for fancy phrases and political expediency. We must cut through the sophistry to the real substance of a Constitution which guarantees equal protection of the laws in a country which is fighting for morality in all parts of the world.

And we must reaffirm, if we would be strong, our religious commitment to the essential dignity and equality of all men under God—yes, even in Alabama.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. All Americans must be aware of the fact that what has taken place in Selma over the last weekend is a challenge to the Nation. I commend the gentleman from Michigan for the moving statement he has made, and I join him in all that he has said and in the telegram which he has prepared to send to the President, Lyndon Johnson.

When Americans cannot meet in peaceful assembly, when they cannot travel from one community to another, a sad day indeed has fallen on all of us because these are tactics of a police state which have been used time and time again in many places throughout the world. They are places to which we have pointed with sadness and regret, that in those places people should not be able to employ their individual rights to accomplish their purposes.

I join the gentleman from Michigan. I believe, with him, this is a day which we should not let pass until all Americans can, as he has very well put it, be treated on the same basis as any others, regardless of their stature or position in life.

I therefore join in the protest against the vicious and indefensible repression of the attempted civil rights procession in Alabama.

The State police acted under orders from their Governor to use whatever force was necessary to break up this peaceful demonstration. The result was approximately 35 American citizens treated at hospitals.

The Nation has appealed to the conscience of the Alabama Governor and has been repelled by nightsticks and tear gas. It must appeal to the law—to the conscience of those Alabama people who find their reputation sullied by the ignorant and unconcerned, and who recognize the rights and entitlement of all our people.

The United States has the full authority to insist that these constitutional rights be observed and respected—an authority that was strengthened by the Supreme Court in its decisions Monday. Those decisions underlined the importance of the grievances that are being expressed in Southern States.

We have seen in recent years, a growing tide of discontent, often sparked by violence when it has been met with repression. These signs have been marked and pointed out. Progress has been made in removing discrimination, but in a hard core of resistance, a few individuals and a few States have welcomed the measures that brought violence.

This is not an issue that should be looked at as white or Negro, as southerner or northerner. It demands our respect for the qualities of American citizenship to which all are entitled—and it demands insistence on those rights.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Michigan and my colleagues who are protesting the action of the State and also the authorities in Selma, Ala., last week. I notice the American public is shocked and ashamed. We have seen visual evidence in the photographs and on television of what took place.

It is my opinion that this is the most cowardly act ever to take place in the annals of American history.

I am more than pleased to see this large number of Congressmen standing today to protest with the gentleman from Michigan. It is high time that the Federal Government do something on this matter. We passed legislation last year that we thought was going to protect the Negro throughout the Nation, but the Civil Rights Act was not sufficient, and the President should come forth immediately with new legislation.

I urge that the Justice Department or whatever department we must have to

remedy this situation send representatives into Selma or other areas where similar incidents occur, in order that American citizens, regardless of what color, race, or creed they may be, shall be protected.

I join with the gentleman from Michigan in all of his endeavors, and congratulate him. I wish to add my name to the message the gentleman intends to send to the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of telegrams with regard to this matter, and I insert them in the RECORD at this point. They are as follows:

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,

March 9, 1965.

Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL, Jr.,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SIR: An urgent request for you to act to protect Selma marchers and to see that all us citizens be allowed their right to vote.

GUSTAVE M. SOLOMONS.

OLIVIA M. SOLOMONS.

LILLIAN M. STEAD.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,

March 8, 1965.

Representative JAMES O'NEILL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

Selma situation deplorable and appalling. We urge Federal intervention to support Negroes seeking voting rights.

ED AND JANE PONCUS.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,

March 9, 1965.

Congressman THOMAS P. O'NEILL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

Please, please urge immediate Federal protection of Negro-Americans seeking their rights in Selma.

DR. RALPH BAIERLEIN.

BOSTON, MASS.,

March 8, 1965.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

Shocked by Sunday's brutal attack on Negro Americans in Selma, Ala. Urge immediate intervention.

PAULINE SWIFT.

BOSTON, MASS.,

March 9, 1965.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Urge you to stand on the floor of the House of Representatives today to protest wanton brutality by State troopers and sheriffs deputies in Selma, Ala., and further, to request immediate Federal intervention and protection for Negro citizens and civil rights workers.

BOSTON FRIENDS OF THE STUDENT NON-VIOLENT COORDINATING COMMITTEE,  
MRS. DOROTHY ZELDKNER.

BOSTON, MASS.,

March 9, 1965.

THOMAS P. O'NEILL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.:

Urge your immediate and vigorous action on behalf of Federal protection against police brutality for Negroes seeking to register in Alabama.

LOIS GREENWOOD.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the events of Sunday in Selma, Ala., have served once again to remind us that the enemies of democracy are not all overseas.

Gov. George Wallace's brutal use of State troopers to break up a peaceful march is clear and simple totalitarianism, reminiscent of Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini.

This Nation is one and indivisible—it can no longer tolerate petty tyrants abusing the basic human rights of our free citizens.

It is clear that the only answer to the dwindling group of racist demagogues still in public office lies in the power of each and every citizen to register and vote. Universal suffrage provides the best hope for removing once and for all the blight of bigotry, brutality, oppression, and discrimination from official places in our national life. More than ever, this Congress and this administration face today the moral imperative of assuring that legislation is passed promptly removing every roadblock and every inhibition on the right of all qualified Americans to register and vote in Federal, State, and local elections. Every day lost is a drain on our national effectiveness, and a blot on our national honor.

The wave of shock, horror, and dismay which all Americans have felt, has been echoed not only from every civilized nation around the world, but also from respected community and business leaders in Selma, and elsewhere in Alabama. I have learned today that many responsible moderate leaders in Selma and elsewhere in Alabama who share the national sense of outrage and shame at the behavior of their Governor, have attempted to communicate with Governor Wallace to express their insistence that the Governor finally disavow the tactics of the tyrant and the despot, and bring back law and order, and domestic tranquility to the Alabama scene. The Governor has been incommunicado and unavailable to all in the Alabama community who have sought to communicate with him.

Governor Wallace is unabashedly pandering to the irresponsible know-nothings on the fringes of Southern life who wish to lead the South back in history down the long, dark road of frustration, bitterness, futility, and despair.

I would like to enter in the RECORD the following editorials from today's issue of the New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, and the Washington Post:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 9, 1965]

#### INCIDENT AT SELMA

The bloody Sunday in Selma, Ala., brings the moral and legal issues in that State once again to a point of crisis.

The right of citizens to assemble peacefully and to petition their elected officials for redress of their grievances is as old as free government and as plain as the Declaration of Independence. The State of Alabama has the responsibility to protect its citizens, both Negro and white, in the exercise of that right.

Gov. George C. Wallace has instead chosen to meet peaceful protest with armed force. By authorizing State troopers, sheriff's depu-

ties, and members of a volunteer posse to attack a group of private citizens, he has written another shameful page in his own record and in the history of Alabama.

The scene in Selma resembled that in a police state. Heavily armed men attacked the marchers. The first 10 or 20 Negroes were swept to the ground screaming, arms and legs flying. Tear gas was used. Fifteen or twenty nightsticks could be seen through the gas, flailing at the heads of the marchers. The hurried rout went on. Four or five women lay on the grass strip where the troopers had knocked them down. Witnesses said they saw possemen using whips on the fleeing Negroes as they recrossed the bridge.

If this is described as law enforcement, it is misnamed. It is nothing more nor less than race-conscious officialdom run amuck. It disgraces not only the State of Alabama but every citizen of the country in which it can happen.

[From the New York Herald Tribune,  
Mar. 9, 1965]

#### WALLACE CROSSES THE RUBICON

The river was the Alabama and Governor Wallace was nowhere near. But it was in fact his Rubicon, and he crossed it. By the stupid brutality used to break up a peaceful march from Selma to the State capital, the voter registration practices of Alabama were indicted before the American people as they could have been in no other way, and the eventual end of those practices was assured.

Had there been even a modicum of good sense and good will in the Governor's office, the march on Montgomery could have been organized to insure a minimum of disruption of traffic—about which Mr. Wallace pretended to be so concerned. But had there been that much sense in Montgomery, the march from Selma need never have taken place.

What Governor Wallace did, by turning loose his State troopers on the marchers, was to provide an outlet for the frustrations of his more paleolithic followers. Many white Alabamians cheered the attack. And those cheers, no less than the club-swinging charge of the troopers, will convince the conscience of America that the law of Alabama, as administered by Governor Wallace, is not the law of the land, but club law, used against the disfranchised because they insist upon their constitutional right to enfranchisement.

The result—just as the troubles in Birmingham brought about the Civil Rights Act of 1964—is almost certain to bring about the civil rights act of 1965. Such an act would give statutory backing to the general provisions of the 15th amendment; that is, it would give teeth to the requirement that the right to vote shall not be denied or abridged because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

It is an unhappy thing that a Federal law should be necessary for this purpose; it is always unfortunate when citizens have to turn to Washington for rights or privileges denied them by their native State. But Governor Wallace's resort to raw and wholly unnecessary violence demonstrates that there is no other course open. He has won the skirmish at the Pettus Bridge, but he has lost his war.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 9, 1965]

#### OUTRAGE AT SELMA

The news from Selma, Ala., where police beat and mauled and gassed unarmed, helpless, and unoffending citizens will shock and alarm the whole Nation. It is simply inconceivable that in this day and age, the police who have sworn to uphold the law and protect the citizenry could resort, instead, to violent attacks upon them.

Decent citizens will weep for the wronged and persecuted demonstrators, for the decent citizens of Alabama who must recoil in horror from the spectacle of sadism, for the good name of the Nation before the world. This brutality is the inevitable result of the intolerance fostered by an infamous State government that is without conscience or morals.

The situation calls for more than mere reproach and anguish, but it is not easy to say what can be done to prevent the repetition of this scandalous misuse of police power. Congress, as a beginning, must promptly pass legislation that will put into Federal hands the registration of voters that the Alabama authorities will continue to obstruct as long as they have any discretion. At least, such legislation will put beyond contest the rights that the Negro citizens have been trying to gain by demonstration.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the beautiful and moving views expressed by the gentleman from Michigan and the gentleman from California and, perhaps the most moving of all, the gentlewoman from Oregon. I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan on the outstanding leadership he has demonstrated in this cause. May I state that I will be happy to join him in this telegram he is sending to the President of the United States in this critical and sad hour.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding and sincerely appreciate his taking this special order to provide us all an opportunity to speak and to listen to others on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, the failure of this Nation at Selma, Ala., on March 7, 1965, was more tragic, more costly than we can presently assess. It was tragic that, after searching for 189 years for a system of justice which protects each American in the exercise of his constitutional rights, we found the system inadequate to meet the brutality at Selma. It was costly in what it did to the self-respect of each of us when we bear our just share of the responsibility.

A tragedy such as Selma arouses many emotions within us. Perhaps the first is contempt and disgust for those who hide behind a facade of public trust to mete out torture to innocent and defenseless human beings. Of all the brutes in history who have butchered the innocent, the most contemptible are those who do it in the name of law and order.

Our feeling of compassion for the injured is equaled by our desire to help them. In this regard we, as Members of the U.S. Congress, have a unique opportunity. We write the laws of this land within certain constitutional limitations, and we have the ability to change the Constitution with the approval of three-fourths of the States. Through this process we can set up procedures to strip the power from city policemen and State Governors and any officials in between who demonstrate, as was demonstrated by many in Alabama last Sunday, that they do not possess the morality necessary to exercise public trust. The next few weeks may well determine the neces-

sity of that course. It would be a drastic revision of our system.

A possible alternative lies in our legislative ability to obtain for each American his constitutional rights under our system as it now exists. In my own view such a course is desirable, if it is possible. We have had partial success in recent years. Yesterday's Selmas—Birmingham, Jackson, and Danville—were answered by legislation which seems to effectively guarantee a hungry man's right to buy a meal. We failed to guarantee an interested citizen's right to vote. That failure was a part of the cause of the incident all decent men now deplore.

We have it within our power to remedy our failure of last year. If we are to do it we had best look at why we failed in 1964. We stopped at the pagan altar that some erroneously call "States rights." We sacrificed effective Federal guarantees to vote, and we sacrificed the arms and legs and skulls of those at Selma last Sunday. We must destroy that pagan altar or we cannot preserve our system.

The latest information from the news wire service from Selma is that 2,500 American civil rights proponents including many ministers fulfilled their pledge to demonstrate. They crossed the bridge but were stopped by about 400 armed troopers. Because they decided not to go further, but instead knelt in prayer and then turned back, no violence occurred.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt if there ever will be a more dramatic demonstration of courage and capacity for love than that demonstrated by the man of peace, Martin Luther King.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, President Johnson said in his inaugural message:

Justice requires us to remember that when any citizen denies his fellow, saying, "His color is not mine," or "His beliefs are strange and different," in that moment he betrays America, though his forebears created this Nation.

Nowhere is that betrayal of the American ideal more flagrant than in the open denial of basic rights which this Nation has witnessed these past weeks in Alabama.

Selma, Ala., has become the focal point in the struggle against discrimination and prejudice. Dr. Martin Luther King, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, again stands as a symbol of the determination of the Negro in the South to achieve rights which are guaranteed him under law and denied him in open disregard of law and order.

Children again have joined in the effort to secure rights which they are too young to exercise.

The hallmarks of the freedom movement—courage, dignity, and unity of purpose—have survived the brutalizing atmosphere which exists in Selma and extends even to the executive chambers of that State's capitol in Montgomery.

The denial of the right to vote, the right to assemble and to protest in pub-

lic and the denial of the even more basic right of recourse to law cannot be tolerated. When the instruments of law and order equate "law and order" with the maintenance of the status quo, when the preservers of law and order do themselves disregard law and are the perpetrators of disorder then no man's rights are protected, no man is truly free.

The Justice Department must assume the responsibility for the preservation of order and for the protection of basic rights in Alabama. State government and local government in that State have demonstrated that they are unwilling to do so.

The national conscience demands that this brutality, this denial of basic right, cease.

In addition to our communicating to our great President the depth of our concern in this matter, there are other steps that we in the Congress should take.

First. Stronger voting legislation, guaranteeing the right to vote in local and State—as well as Federal elections—is a must.

Second. We should demand that the Department of Defense insist on immediate compliance by military installations in Alabama with existing civil rights regulations. And in the event that these regulations are not complied with—said military facilities should be closed down and their functions transferred elsewhere.

Third. All appropriate action to invoke section 2 of the 14th amendment should be undertaken.

Congressional representation should be reduced for those States failing to comply with the Federal Constitution and law—that persons be permitted to vote without regard to race or color.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman from Michigan for his leadership in this genuinely moral crusade.

The conscience of the people of western New York has been deeply touched and moved by the recent events in Alabama. Not since the brutalities of Nazi concentration camps has a series of inhumanities so moved the people in my district. The large outpouring of telegrams and telephone calls to my office confirms this. I have never seen anything quite like it.

I join with the gentleman in his telegram.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, for praying in public Negro citizens in Selma, Ala., have had their heads broken. For seeking humbly to use rights won 100 years ago, they have been gassed, whipped, and smashed with clubs.

Mr. Speaker, each of us in this honorable body took an oath of office to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitu-

tion of the United States. We also invoked the Dicty that we might have wisdom, courage, and strength to perform our responsibilities. All public officials, whether they be Federal, State, or local, have taken a similar oath. It is quite evident from what has happened in Selma, Ala., that some public officials have deserted these oaths. Morality in government cannot prevail if we desert our oaths. Let us not be numbered among those who are accused of desertion.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to compliment the leadership of the gentleman from Michigan in his work in behalf of this program which Dr. Martin Luther King has exemplified so well in Selma, Ala.

My desk, like those of the rest of the Members, is crowded with wires and letters from constituents who are concerned over this situation.

I commend today the courage of those ministers who have gone down to Selma, Ala., to join the peaceful marchers in search of the free rights of citizenship.

I am one of the 15 Members of the House who recently made the trip to Selma. Surely the responsible citizens of that great State will soon see the disaster which looms to their industry and commerce if the present course is continued.

I certainly support the closing of bases in Alabama.

Coincidental with our Selma trip, the literacy test was thrown out. The well-known Los Angeles Times recently published a copy of this test and pointed out that few, even of high educational attainments, could expect to pass the test.

Public opinion now is catching up with Selma.

I join my colleagues in expressing my sorrow over these conditions.

The ultimate in a State's disgrace has now been reached in these attacks against citizens in peaceful prayer.

I wonder how many Members saw the cartoon published in the newspaper this morning, which showed a trooper washing his club? As shown in the cartoon, there was the statement that he got "one good crack at her before she got into the church."

Conditions are serious. I trust that the House will soon, by appropriate legislation, correct the registration situation.

I urge that immediate steps be taken by our Government to stop this vicious brutality which is being used by State troopers in Alabama.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, recent actions by State authorities in Alabama, aided and abetted by the office of the sheriff of Dallas County, are a cause of shame for all Americans. They also should impel all Americans to resolve that such storm trooper tactics cannot be allowed to continue or recur.

The following is the text of a telegram that I dispatched yesterday to the Attorney General of the United States:

All decent people are sickened by yesterday's events in Selma, Ala. The savage assault on peaceful demonstrators by those who officially represent the State of Alabama cannot be permitted to go unchallenged.

Yesterday's events exceed the brutality of Birmingham in 1963. Civil government in Alabama has become an instrument of mob violence. A uniformed mob is an even greater threat to freedom than is a civilian mob. It cannot be permitted to commit outrageous acts with impunity.

Weapons used by State troopers and their allies, coupled with their actions, compel conclusion that there was a brazen conspiracy to deprive citizens of their Federal rights. This appears to fall within the purview of civil rights laws now in effect.

Only a strong, clear and prompt Federal response can prevent continued and renewed actions of this kind.

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,  
Member of Congress.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I was truly shocked and saddened at the reports that came from Selma, Ala., yesterday. Especially appalling were the television news features that showed people being trampled, gassed, and savagely beaten. What is most disturbing is that this brutal violence was not initiated by some disorganized mob of citizens; rather it was the official, organized action of the so-called law enforcement agencies of Alabama. I hesitate to make this comparison, but the action yesterday of the Alabama State police reminded me of the ruthlessness of the Hitler regime in Germany. This police violence and terror is the most shocking part of the whole sordid episode. The police in a democracy are supposed to protect the citizens, not terrorize and brutalize him as we have just witnessed.

This action suggests the complete breakdown of whatever moderate forces that existed in Alabama. We have now seen that the Negro in Alabama cannot even rely on those officials that were counseling moderation. We must now realize that the local officials no matter how sympathetic to justice are unable to control the situation and prevent the extremists from terrorizing the Negroes. If this means the necessity of Federal marshals or even Federal troops, then that is what we must do. Justice is the most basic right to which every American is entitled. The Negro cannot now find it with the police of Alabama—he must find it somewhere. And we in the Congress must secure it for him.

In the words of the Washington Post this morning: "The situation calls for more than mere reproach and anguish." We must immediately begin the speedy consideration of stronger Federal voter registration legislation. I hope the administration will submit a proposal to the Congress promptly for our consideration.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, there is in our Nation today a sense of shame over the outrageous situation in Selma, Ala. Indeed, there is a widespread sense of indignation that such brutality could take place in the United States.

The conduct of the Alabama State troopers, in using clubs and tear gas and cattle prods against a peaceful crowd was brutal, senseless, and stupid.

The repression of Sunday's march in Selma has, in the words once used by the late Justice Felix Frankfurter, "seared the conscience" of the decent people of America.

Dr. Martin Luther King and his followers will ultimately prevail because their struggle is based on the belief that the people of America are basically decent, and that in a democratic society the techniques of nonviolence must succeed. This decency, however, is not always a self-acting ingredient. No social advance rolls forward automatically. It comes through the efforts and the courage of dedicated individuals, such as the individuals fighting for the right to vote in Selma. We should be grateful to them.

The dark days of 1963, when "Bull" Connor used his police dogs in Birmingham, proved to be a major turning point in the struggle for civil rights for America's Negroes. This week's confrontation in Selma will be no less a milestone in awakening America's conscience.

At the very least, the need for additional legislation to protect voter rights has become overwhelmingly clear.

I join my colleagues in condemning Gov. George Wallace's resort to violence and his encouragement of more violence. But we must do more than call for justice. We must be ready for legislative action to help the people of Alabama, for their sake and for the sake of our Nation.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I was sickened by the films shown of the attack by State troopers in Alabama on demonstrators from the city of Selma this past Sunday.

At the same time, I was pleased to see that these films were taken and were shown throughout the Nation. This was one of the grossest displays of sheer brutality and unnecessary force used by public law enforcement officers that has ever been shown so starkly to a broad audience, with relation to the current struggle for equal rights being undertaken by the civil rights movement.

What misguided form of reasoning gives any one citizen of this Nation the idea that he has the right to treat another citizen in such a manner?

Does any State official of any State in the United States have the right to violate the constitutional rights of the people so flagrantly—the right "peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances?"

It is my sincere hope that the people of the United States will express loud and continuing dismay in rapidly increasing numbers now that they have had the opportunity to view the inhumanity with which the marchers were attacked, beaten, and whipped.

I believe, as well, that there is no reason why the Department of Justice cannot step in to protect the beleaguered citizens of the State of Alabama from uncivilized action such as was displayed

on this black Sunday—by troopers acting under orders from the Governor of that State.

If Governor Wallace believes that the troopers went beyond the bounds of "necessary force," I would also call upon him to conduct a thorough investigation and remove every man sharing any part of the responsibility for this shameful act of hoodlumism from the State's employ.

If the Governor agrees that these actions were proper, he should consider strongly the only recourse he has left—to resign.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, before the eyes of the Nation and the world, Governor Wallace's storm-troopers made a brash assault upon the innocent, liberty-seeking citizens who quietly marched in protest to the State capital at Montgomery. The group was peaceably assembled and armed only with the right of petition and protest. They had every right to proceed with their mission of honor. If their destination had been Washington, instead of Montgomery, they would have been proceeding in interstate commerce and within Federal jurisdiction. Since they were proceeding to petition for their rights under the U.S. Constitution, the journey was entirely within the scope of "Federal" protection. It is regrettable that the "assault" was not anticipated so that the marchers, like any other citizens could pursue their legal rights of petition and protest.

This situation calls for prompt Federal action. New Federal legislation to provide a system of voting registrars is required, but apparently cannot be enacted soon enough to provide remedies for the aggrieved Negro citizens of Selma.

There are other procedures which the Federal Government can follow. If the State of Alabama chooses to declare war on the U.S. Constitution and the rights which it confers on all of its citizens, our Federal Government can take immediate steps as proposed by our distinguished colleague from New York, the Honorable BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, and proceed to shut down and move military installations, and critical space and defense work to areas of greater constitutional security. From the standpoint of the vital national security, it would seem wise to remove critical facilities from a State which supports the power to oppress. These economic sanctions would serve to bring home to many of the people of Alabama the necessity of respecting the fundamental laws of the land.

The shame of Selma, is the shame of America, and no citizen can feel free of the responsibility to act. The right of the citizens of Selma to petition is as fundamental as the right to live. No State can deny this right if it is peaceably pursued as it was last Sunday. The breach of the peace was committed by those of ill purpose who wielded the clubs and brought the blood. Their trial is now before the Nation and the world.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy in Alabama has brought shame to every citizen of this Nation who be-

lieves in the rights of man. The Episcopal Bishop of Los Angeles, the Right Reverend Francis Eric Bloy, expressed the feelings of horror that swept the Nation in the following telegram he sent to me today. It reads as follows:

I and many of the clergy and laity of the Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles are shocked beyond description at the violence perpetrated against our fellow citizens yesterday in Selma, Ala., by the elected officials and police officers of that State. In the face of such a national disgrace we urge you to use the full moral and political power of your office to insure to all citizens of Alabama the peaceful and unmolested exercise of their guaranteed rights and privileges as children of God, and as citizens of these United States and as our brothers in Christ.

FRANCIS ERIC BLOY,  
Bishop of Los Angeles.

I know Bishop Bloy expresses the feelings not only of himself and his fellow members of the clergy, but of every decent citizen. Let us not permit their call to go unheeded.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in deploring the outrageous situation in Selma, Ala.

It is hard to believe that in this country, in this day and age, such officially condoned brutality could be permitted to occur.

Our American Constitution is now almost 180 years old, and the first 10 amendments to that Constitution, the Bill of Rights, is nearly 175 years old. During all those years American citizens have had a constitutionally guaranteed right to free speech, to assemble peacefully, and to petition their government for redress of their grievances.

The news from Selma these past few days tells of a tragic suppression of those basic rights of citizenship.

We all have read in the newspapers, and heard on the radio, and seen on television the shocking and terrible actions of Gov. George C. Wallace's Alabama State police and Sheriff James G. Clark's Dallas County posse in stopping a peaceful march of some 500 citizens from Selma to the Alabama capitol at Montgomery.

The purpose of this march was to protest against the unconscionable and continuing deprivation of the right of Negro citizens to register and vote in the elections held in that State.

Instead of protecting and assuring the right to assemble peacefully for this purpose, and to submit their petition for redress of grievances to the authorities in Montgomery, the State troopers, under direct orders from Governor Wallace, and the mounted county posse under command of Sheriff Clark, violently and repeatedly attacked the unarmed, helpless and unoffending group of citizens with clubs, whips, and tear gas bombs.

This entirely unwarranted and vicious assault on the peaceful citizens of Selma was also nothing less than a planned, official assault on the Constitution itself.

Certainly, the officials in Alabama have written another sad and shameful page in the history of that State.

But we dare not stand idly by while the rights of our fellow citizens are trampled upon.

We in Congress have a serious obligation to enact any additional legislation that may be necessary to guarantee that the rights of all Americans will be observed.

It is my hope that the administration will move rapidly to complete drafting this legislation and to submit it to the House and Senate for their early consideration.

In circumstances like those we have seen in Selma there is simply no substitute for a strong, Federal statutory guarantee of the free exercise of the rights we all possess simply by virtue of our birth in this "land of the free."

In addition, and more to the point of immediate relief in such an intolerable situation as now exists in Selma, the Federal courts must act with dispatch in deciding cases and enforcing decisions to protect the constitutional rights of American citizens.

Finally, the executive branch must be alert and aggressive in defending the right to equal treatment under the law that is a cherished birthright of us all.

Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy have faced similar defiance on the part of State and local officials—and they have acted.

They have acted under the authority of title 10, section 333, of the United States Code. That section reads as follows:

The President, by using the militia or the armed forces, or both, or by any other means, shall take such measures as he considers necessary to suppress, in a State, any insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combination, or conspiracy, if it—

(1) so hinders the execution of the laws of that State, and of the United States within the State that any part or class of its people is deprived of a right, privilege, immunity or protection named in the Constitution and secured by law, and the constituted authorities of that State are unable, fail, or refuse to protect that right, privilege or immunity, or to give that protection; or

(2) opposes or obstructs the execution of the laws of the United States or impedes the course of justice under those laws.

In any situation covered by clause (1), the State shall be considered to have denied the equal protection of the laws secured by the Constitution.

It seems to me that the time has come again to act. The lives and safety of American citizens are at stake—and the full majesty and full resources of the United States must be exerted to preserve and protect the precious heritage of freedom and equality we all are entitled to enjoy.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government cannot stand aside while its citizens are brutally assaulted in the exercise and pursuit of their constitutional rights. Those who are courageously fighting for the right to vote in Selma are fighting for a right which has been established for nearly 100 years. In the eloquent words of Mr. Justice Goldberg:

These rights are present rights; they are not merely hopes to some future enjoyment of some formalistic constitutional promise. The basic guarantees of our Constitution are warrants for the here and now. (Watson v. Memphis, 373 U.S. 526, 533 (1963).)

Incredible as it may seem, the right to vote is not available here and now for large numbers of our Negro citizens. In Dallas County, Ala., where Selma is located, for example, more than 90 percent of the Negroes are not registered as a result of a systematic conspiracy on the part of State and local officials to keep them from the ballot. This intolerable situation makes a mockery of our democratic system.

Voting discrimination is no longer accepted by Negro citizens. It must not be accepted by any American and, least of all, by the Federal Government. In Selma, State and local police have used clubs, bullwhips, and tear gas in a brutal effort to stop peaceful assembly, protest, and petition—all rights guaranteed by the Federal Government. While we are speaking, at this very moment there may very well be a repetition of these events. There will be other Selmas as there were other Birmingham. It is time to act.

The Federal Government has a clear obligation to act. It cannot hide behind a cloak of legality. Under 10 U.S.C. 333 and other statutes it has authority to act.

Title 10, United States Code, section 333 states:

The President, by using the militia or the armed forces, or both, or by any other means, shall take such measures as he considers necessary to suppress, in a State, any insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combination, or conspiracy, if it—

(1) so hinders the execution of the laws of that State, and of the United States within the State, that any part or class of its people is deprived of a right, privilege, immunity, or protection named in the Constitution and secured by law, and the constituted authorities of that State are unable, fail, or refuse to protect that right, privilege, or immunity, or to give that protection; or

(2) opposes or obstructs the execution of the laws of the United States or impedes the course of justice under those laws.

In any situation covered by clause (1), the State shall be considered to have denied the equal protection of the laws secured by the Constitution.

Under section 241 and 242, title 18, United States Code, it is unlawful to either conspire—section 241—to deprive through threats, intimidation or oppression American citizens of their constitutional rights or under color of State law—section 242—to deprive American citizens of their constitutional liberties. It is true that the U.S. Supreme Court in *Screws v. United States*, 325 U.S. 91 (1945) narrowly construed these statutes making it difficult to implement them. But the fact that it is difficult to get southern juries to convict must not serve as an excuse for inaction under these statutes. The Federal Government cannot allow juries to abrogate Federal laws. In addition, the mere fact that the Federal Government will bring suits against State and local officials for violating constitutional rights acts as a deterrent.

Mr. Speaker, Federal marshals should be sent immediately to Selma, Ala. Under section 3053, title 18, United States Code, Federal marshals have the power to arrest on the spot for any offense against Federal law committed in their presence. They can also arrest for

any felony under the laws of the United States if they have reasonable grounds to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing a felony.

In addition, as I did last Sunday before Governor Wallace's planned attack, I again urge that Federal troops be sent under the authority of title 10, United States Code, section 333.

Mr. Speaker, Congress also has an obligation. The underlying problem in Selma is the deprivation of voting rights. It is clear that past civil rights legislation has not adequately met this crucial problem. Today I have introduced a bill which should effectively deal with the question of voting rights. My bill establishes a system of Federal registration offices and Federal registrars. Federal registrars would be appointed by the President upon a finding of discrimination in voting in a locality by either the Federal district court or the Civil Rights Commission. Once appointed, the registrars would issue registration certificates to applicants which would be valid for all elections. The Federal registrars would not recognize literacy or constitutional interpretation tests. The only qualifications for voting would be age, residency, and sanity. The poll tax would also be abolished in local elections.

The U.S. courts would have the power to issue injunctions and other orders to require local and State voting officials to allow persons issued registration certificates by the Federal registrar the right to vote and to have their votes counted.

In addition, the courts would be empowered to void any election except for President, Vice President, or presidential electors, in which registration certificates issued by the Federal registrar were not recognized and required to do so wherever 50 persons holding such certificates were denied the right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, Selma is a test of this Government and this Congress. Both the Government and the Congress must act to the full extent of their power—otherwise the result may be catastrophic.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, since Sunday night, the people of America have been shocked by treatment given to American citizens, many of whom are war veterans, women, and children, by the law enforcement agencies in the town of Selma, as well as by State officials of the State of Alabama.

Accordingly I have sent the following telegram to the President:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In brutally breaking up a peaceable march of Negroes, guilty only of demanding their right to vote, the Alabama State Police and the civilians who abetted them have outraged the Nation and badly distorted its image abroad. How can we hope to convince the world that we are fighting to preserve democracy in South Vietnam when we are unable to protect it in Selma? If the totally unwarranted violence of the troopers in Selma reflect the official attitude of the State of Alabama, as it surely must, then it is crystal clear that the intervention of Federal marshals is not only proper, but urgently necessary.

Respectfully yours,  
JOHN M. MURPHY,  
Member of Congress.

The Federal Government cannot stand idly by and permit constitutional rights to be denied qualified American voters. Time undoubtedly will solve the problem. However, the time for strong legislative remedies is now. In retrospect, we will find that the strongest force in bringing about these reforms was the precipitous action of the Chief Executive of the State of Alabama. The New York Daily News editorial which follows, sums up his contribution to the civil rights movement in America:

#### THE SHAME OF ALABAMA

Last Sunday, some 600 Negroes attempted a right-to-vote march, from Selma, Ala., to the State capital, Montgomery, 50 miles away. Before they had gone a mile, local police and Gov. George Wallace's State troopers assailed the peaceful demonstrators with clubs, whips, ropes, and tear gas.

The resultant reports and pictures, read and viewed by a shocked nation, alienated whatever sympathy Governor Wallace's fanatic segregationist stand might have been drawing.

Wallace's almost unbelievable explanation—"It has always been my policy to use the least force possible in these situations. I'm always sorry when anybody gets hurt"—could only elicit added shudders.

So why, with everything going his way, Dr. Martin Luther King decided yesterday to gamble immediately on a new march, defying not only a Federal court but a Presidential plea for restraint, passive understanding. Perhaps so many sympathetic VIP's, black and white, were on hand and eager to march that Dr. King felt he just had to put on a modest show.

Actually, Gov. George Wallace, left to himself, has emerged as the most effective helper the civil rights movement ever had. If Dr. King will just let Wallace do what comes naturally, meanwhile protecting his own followers from unnecessary danger, the battle should soon be history.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, the news of the past few days in Selma, Ala., where police have beaten, mauled, and gassed unarmed and unoffending citizens has been a cause for grave alarm for our Nation. Had it not just happened, it would be unthinkable in this day and age that police who have sworn to uphold the law and protect the citizenry could turn on them with a violent attack.

The right of citizens to assemble peacefully and to petition their elected officials for redress of their grievances is as old as free government and as plain as the Constitution. The State of Alabama has the responsibility to protect its citizens, both Negro and white, in the exercise of that right.

But Gov. George C. Wallace has instead chosen to meet peaceful protest with armed force, and by so doing has brought shame to his State and to our Nation.

With the enactment of the civil rights law of 1964, the perpetrators of bigotry and discrimination should have recognized the end of a shameful era and the beginning of a new era in which all citizens shall enjoy the rights and privileges granted them under the Constitution. The consensus of responsible Americans is denouncing racial prejudice; the clergy who went to Selma and the white citizens

of Alabama who protested the recent infamous events speak for the great majority, who will no longer tolerate discrimination and violence.

Unless the State of Alabama recognizes that the tide is turning against bigotry, and unless the Negroes living in Alabama be given their right to vote, then there is no other course of action left to the Congress but to enact strong voting rights legislation, providing for whatever is necessary to insure that Negroes be given the unqualified right to vote. And I hasten to add that I would be a strong supporter of this action.

#### NEW VOTING RIGHTS LEGISLATION IS ESSENTIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is confronted with a crisis in Selma which springs directly from the failure to secure for all Americans the right to vote regardless of race, color, or national origin. It is incredible that almost 100 years after the adoption of the 15th amendment this is an issue. However, events in Alabama, Mississippi, and elsewhere in the South have proven that the promise of our Constitution has not been fulfilled. Congress has been aware of this fact. In 1957 and again in 1960 civil rights laws were enacted. This legislation failed to secure the right to vote to all citizens, and last year we enacted the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Again it failed. Daily occurrences in Alabama and Mississippi show the extent of this failure. Past civil rights laws did not truly meet the problem. We must have legislation that will use the full force any power of the Federal Government to secure voting rights.

It is a breach of faith in democracy for any citizen to be deprived of the ballot because of the color of his skin. When millions are so deprived, it is a fundamental failure of our democratic system. Let us make no mistake about the fact that millions of Negro citizens have been denied the right to vote.

Despite the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964, the percentage of Negroes of voting age who are registered in the 11 Southern States is still intolerably low. The following statistics as of November 1964 on Negro registration in the South were compiled by the Southern Regional Council and incorporated into the record of the hearings held by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in Jackson, Miss., during February 1965:

	Percent
Alabama.....	23.0
Arkansas.....	49.3
Florida.....	63.7
Georgia.....	44.0
Louisiana.....	32.0
Mississippi.....	6.7
North Carolina.....	46.8
South Carolina.....	38.8
Tennessee.....	69.4
Texas.....	57.7
Virginia.....	45.7

In Louisiana there has been only a 1-percent increase in Negro registration

over the last 8 years. In Mississippi approximately 25,000 Negroes are registered out of an estimated 400,000 who are eligible; in 1890, before Mississippi undertook systematic disenfranchisement of Negroes, there were 189,000 Negroes on the voting rolls.

The percentage of eligible whites registered in the same States is much higher—as reported by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in 1961:

	Percent
Alabama.....	63.6
Arkansas.....	60.9
Florida.....	69.5
Georgia.....	49.8
Louisiana.....	77.0
Mississippi.....	67.0
North Carolina.....	92.8
South Carolina.....	84.5
Tennessee.....	83.5
Texas.....	50.9
Virginia.....	46.2

<sup>1</sup> Does not include totals for all counties.

If the percentage of registered Negroes were increased to equal the percentage of registered whites in the 11 Southern States, at least 1,238,000 Negroes would be added to the voting rolls.

In States outside the South 78 percent of eligible Negroes are registered; in the Southern States some 40 percent are registered. In States outside the South 80 percent of eligible whites are registered; in the Southern States some 70 percent are registered.

Although these statistics reveal a clear pattern of racial discrimination in voting, they hardly tell the whole story.

The other part, the story of courage and human suffering, is recorded in such accounts as yesterday's report of Sunday's brutality in Selma:

Alabama State Troopers and volunteer officers of the Dallas County sheriff's office tore through a column of Negro demonstrators with tear gas, nightsticks, and whips here yesterday to enforce Gov. George C. Wallace's order against a march from Selma to Montgomery. At least 10 Negroes were hospitalized with injuries and 30 to 40 more were given emergency treatment for injuries and tear gas effects.

The recipient of the Noble Prize for Peace is jailed while leading Negroes in Selma, Ala., in a drive aimed at securing rights which under the Constitution and in morality are already theirs. And the Federal Government stands by helplessly because all the provisions of all the civil rights laws are inadequate to secure these citizens the right to vote guaranteed by the 15th amendment.

Sheriff Lawrence Rainey of Neshoba County, Miss., smiles at the dismissal of the indictment arising from the cold-blooded murder of three young Americans whose only offense was trying to aid others in their attempt to be full citizens.

Police in Marion, Ala., mobilize to stop the efforts of Negroes to vote. One American citizen loses his life; several are injured; and still no Negro is registered to vote in Marion.

We read those accounts.

But we do not read about the sharecropper who is thrown off the plantation for daring to attempt to register or the housewife whose home is bombed while

her children sleep because she dared to allow civil rights workers in her house. We do not read about the constant intimidation, threats, and violence to those who courageously strive for their freedom and to those who courageously aid their fellow citizens to achieve full citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, America has experienced intimidation, terror, violence and murder aimed at destroying the Constitution. Congress must protect that covenant and prevent further trampling on constitutional liberties. Congress has the power under the 14th and 15th amendments, and it must be exercised.

The voting rights bill which I introduced today will stop the disenfranchisement of American citizens in all elections—local, State, and Federal.

This bill deals with the right to vote at three levels, empowering the Federal Government to act quickly and effectively at each level:

First. Determination of disenfranchisement: Either the U.S. District Court or the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights may make the operative finding that the right to vote has been denied because of race, color, or national origin.

Second. Registration: The bill provides for a system of Federal registration officers and Federal registrars appointed by the President. The Federal registrars would issue certificates of registration to applicants who meet State voting qualifications of age, residency, and sanity.

Third. Enforcement of the right to vote: The Federal registrars would oversee elections, make tallies and report any denial of the right to vote. The bill would make it a crime to interfere with anyone trying to register or to vote.

Under existing law only through a cumbersome procedure in the district courts can a prospective voter who is denied registration because of race or color obtain an order declaring him qualified to vote. If the court orders that a Negro citizen be registered on the same basis as a white citizen, then the barriers of literacy and constitutional interpretation tests and other devices remain. In short, present law offers no prompt and effective remedy.

Mr. Speaker, under the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution, Congress has the power to legislate for all elections—local, State, and Federal.

The 15th amendment states:

The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

I know it is not necessary to spell out the importance of reaching local and State elections. Look at the tragic consequences of electing local sheriffs like Clarke of Dallas County, Ala., or Rainey of Neshoba County, Miss.

My bill makes it mandatory for the President to create Federal registration offices and to appoint Federal registrars in areas where either the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights or the Federal district court finds persons have been deprived of registration, or of the opportunity of registration, because of their

race, color, or national origin. The Federal registration offices would be in operation for a minimum of 1 year.

Although present law provides that a Federal court may appoint "voting referees" upon finding a pattern or practice of discrimination in an area, only one referee has been appointed since the law was enacted in 1960. Referees do not have the power to register voters, but only to receive applications for court orders of qualification to vote, take evidence, and report to the court.

By using the Commission on Civil Rights as an alternative to the Federal district courts for the purpose of making a finding requiring the President to establish a Federal registration office and appoint a Federal registrar, the hostile attitude of certain Federal judges will be avoided. For instance, District Judge Harold Cox, of Mississippi, would be unable to prevent the appointment of Federal registrars.

In the 87th and 88th Congresses I proposed similar legislation to provide for the appointment of Federal enrollment officers by the President upon the recommendation of the Commission on Civil Rights.

The Federal registrar would issue registration certificates to any applicant whom he finds to meet the residence, age, and sanity requirements for voting in the State. These are the only qualifications recognized. Literacy and constitutional interpretation tests as well as poll taxes are eliminated.

Let me refer to what I said on the floor of the House on January 12, 1965. It is still valid:

The literacy test, including constitutional interpretation tests, is a primary tool employed to flaunt the 15th amendment. I have seen at firsthand how the constitutional interpretation test is used in Mississippi to discriminate against Negro citizens.

Section 244 of the Mississippi constitution requires that an applicant be able to read and write any section of the constitution of the State and give a reasonable interpretation thereof to the county registrar. County clerks have complete discretion in administering and grading the test. They select the sections to be interpreted. I have seen sections selected for Negroes which constitutional lawyers would find difficult to explain. On the other hand, white applicants are given the easiest sections.

Even when a reasonable interpretation has been given by a Negro, the applicant has been rejected \* \* \*

Literacy tests are obstacles to the right and opportunity to vote which must be eliminated.

The impression was created that, by making the completion of six grades of education presumptive proof of literacy, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 eliminated the effect of discriminatory literacy tests. Nothing could be farther from the truth. It merely created a rebuttable presumption in a legal proceeding instituted after the denial of registration.

Yesterday the U.S. Supreme Court unanimously declared invalid the constitutional interpretation test used by Louisiana. The Court said:

This is not a test but a trap, sufficient to stop even the most brilliant man on his way to the voting booth. The cherished right of

the people in a country like ours to vote cannot be obliterated by the use of laws like this.

This decision paves the way for judicial decisions outlawing similar tests in Alabama and Mississippi. But why should we wait for the courts to knock down these barriers one by one? Congress should eliminate these discriminatory tests once and for all.

Although the poll tax in Federal elections has been outlawed, poll taxes are still used to block Negroes from voting at the State and local level. The poll tax must be eliminated completely.

The Federal registrars, who could appoint deputies subject to the approval of the Attorney General, would oversee all elections, make tallies, and report any denials of the right to vote, or to have the vote counted, to the court or the Commission on Civil Rights.

My bill provides that the district court would have the power to issue injunctions and other orders to require local and State voting officials to permit persons issued certificates of registration by Federal registrars the right to vote and to have their votes counted.

Mr. Speaker, the history of the struggle for the right to vote over the past 100 years shows that effective sanctions will be necessary. Therefore, the Federal courts would be empowered to void any election except for President, Vice President or presidential electors, in which registration certificates issued by Federal registrars were not recognized and required to do so where 50 or more persons holding certificates were denied this right to vote.

It would be a crime punishable by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both, to interfere with anyone attempting to apply for a certificate of registration or to interfere with anyone who holds a certificate and is attempting to vote. The intimidation and economic coercion of Negroes in the South has been a prime deterrent to registration and must be eradicated.

Mr. Speaker, the surging energy of the drive for freedom and justice will not abate until full civil rights are secured. First there must be equality at the ballot box. Immediate and effective legislation is needed to make the right to vote a reality for all Americans and to insure that our Government derives its just powers from the consent of all the governed.

#### OUR SUPPLY LINE THROUGH FRANCE HURTS OUR BALANCE OF PAYMENTS—IS IT REALLY A MILITARY NECESSITY?

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, our balance-of-payments deficit, still running at a rate of around \$3 billion a year, continues to weaken us. We are constantly urged to court a recession at home by adopting high interest rates and other restrictive policies. We are constantly tempted to move toward autarchy in for-

eign economic policy, as by tying purchases to American goods, restricting imports, imposing clogs on the flow of capital. We constantly put off until tomorrow—when we hope our payments will be in balance—the diplomatic initiatives which we ought to be taking today.

The President, on February 10, tabled before the Congress a constructive program to bring our payments into balance. I wish to talk today about the biggest governmental item in our balance-of-payments deficit—our defense expenditures abroad.

The President, in his February 10 message, pointed out that:

We have already made major progress in cutting the outflow of dollars for our defenses abroad—without impairing our strength or our defense commitment to the free world.

I call attention today to an important area of balance-of-payments leakage in the military sphere—the fact that we have been adding almost a quarter of a billion dollars a year to our balance-of-payments deficit by maintaining a line of communication across France to support our six divisions in West Germany. It is time to inquire whether the damage to our balance-of-payments position caused by maintaining the line of communication through France in its present form is adequately compensated by the military and diplomatic values we obtain from it.

According to unpublished information I have obtained from the Department of Commerce, the balance-of-payments cost of U.S. military expenditures in Western Europe for the last fiscal year, that ending June 30, 1964, came to \$1.5 billion. The great preponderance of this deficit comes from our military expenditures in four countries—\$707 million in West Germany, \$231 million in France, \$178 million in the United Kingdom, and \$95 million in Italy. In the case of Germany, the United Kingdom, and Italy, their amounts are very substantially offset by these countries' procurement of military hardware in the United States, so that the net balance-of-payments impact is not great.

This is not true, however, in France. Our efforts to secure offsetting expenditures in the United States from the French have been almost totally unsuccessful. The result is that the \$231 million we spent in France in the last fiscal year represents substantially a net deficit to France.

A small part of this American deficit is attributable to our share of the NATO Command near Paris. Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer is Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, and U.S. commander in chief, Europe, with his headquarters near Paris. The main sources of our military deficit with France lie in the line of communications stretching from Bordeaux and St. Nazaire to the German border, and in Air Force facilities. The Army maintains a communications zone headquarters at Orleans, a depot at Verdun, headquarters of the supporting Seine Area Command at Fontainebleau, and garrisons and

other installations at Metz, Nancy, Toul, Chize, Bracon, Bussac, Captieux, Chinon, Saumur, Ingrandes, Poitiers, and Croix-Chapeau—16 facilities in all, including petroleum pipelines and ammunition dumps.

The Air Force maintains 11 facilities or bases in France. At President de Gaulle's request, no American tactical air forces are now based in France. Between 40,000 and 50,000 American servicemen, plus their 40,000 dependents, are now stationed in France. It is largely their expenditures in French francs, and the salaries we pay French civilian employees, which add up to our tremendous net deficit.

Before getting into the reasons, historical and otherwise, for our military presence in France, let us look at the effect of the balance-of-payments deficit which it causes us. The other side of the coin, of course, is the balance-of-payments surplus which it gives France. Abundant surpluses for France have turned out recently to be thorns in our flesh. Other countries, by and large, have been content to hold dollars and not make exorbitant demands on our dwindling gold supply. The French, alas, have been quite difficult as they line up at the window and demand gold in return for their dollars. President de Gaulle has said that from now on, all or practically all of the additional dollars France earns will be turned in gold. He has been as good as his word: So far in 1965, the French have demanded and received from us more than \$200 million in gold, much more than the \$36 million in net sales of gold to all the world, including France, in all of 1964.

Thus the \$231 million deficit we run with France for the purpose of protecting her militarily is about as debilitating a deficit as we could possibly have.

Now, with a map handy, let us look at why it is that the main supply line for our divisions in West Germany runs largely through the tortuous line from the Bay of Biscay over the plains of France to the Palatinate. Why is it that America, which rules the waves, does not make a permanent peacetime switch to ports and lines of communication that are infinitely closer to the men who are being supplied—such ports as Bremen—Bremerhaven—and Hamburg in Germany, and Rotterdam in the Netherlands?

The answer is largely historical. The supply line through France grew up during World War II when American armies were forcing the Germans back on the Continental Shelf. France was the only ground we liberated and controlled, and thus was the only real estate on which a communication zone could be placed.

When the war was over, we needed the communication zone to supply our army of occupation. And with the cold war, and the evolution of NATO, what was more natural than to continue the convenient zone of communications through France to Germany?

There were two additional reasons in the early 1950's for maintaining this France-oriented communication zone.

In the first place, the French were our brothers in arms in World War II, and West Germany was a still-unproved ally. France needed the American presence on her soil at least as much as Germany. Moreover, the idea of a forward strategy—that the battle for Europe, if one came, would be fought on German soil as close to the first Russian trespass as possible—had not fully developed.

A second reason was that in those Marshall plan days, France had a devastating need for dollars. These were the days of offshore procurement, when American military orders were as much as possible placed with our European allies in order to help their balance of payments. What better way of helping our French friends than to continue a large and costly American presence on French soil?

It is time we asked, Mr. Speaker, whether these considerations are still valid today. Does the free world still need these scores of thousands of U.S. servicemen in France? Does the U.S. need to increase its payments deficit, and France's surplus? Surely the answer to both questions is: "No."

Should not the United States, then, go before our NATO allies, France included, and ask that the line of communications and the air installations across France be put into mothballs, and our American forces in Germany be supplied through non-French ports, particularly Bremen—Bremerhaven—where use can be made of the West German pipeline and transportation complex? There would remain in France the NATO-oriented installations, but the great bulk of the 40,000 to 50,000 U.S. servicemen and their dependents could be removed from French soil and returned home.

The NATO alliance is hurt, not helped, by the quarter-billion-dollar annual drain on the U.S. balance of payments caused by our present presence in France.

I have emphasized, Mr. Speaker, that mothballing our French installations should be an allied decision, not a unilateral U.S. decision. But is it not in the interest of the allies to have a financially strong United States? Our determination to supply our divisions in Germany directly, rather than through a vulnerable long line of communications through France, would strengthen rather than diminish the credibility of our determination to fight on the ground west of the Iron Curtain, and not to let the Continent be overrun. Every once in a while some nervous German worries that the U.S. forces might, in the event of war, commence a movement to the rear, perhaps to a defense position around the Massif Central in France. Our supplying Germany directly should go far to scotch this rumor.

But what if a Russian incursion should grab the Atlantic ports of Hamburg, Bremen, and Rotterdam? A reactivated line of communication through France would then be available to the forces of the West. I have no doubts as to where

the loyalties of the French nation stand: we would all be fighting together. If it were otherwise, there would be no Western Alliance.

Despite President de Gaulle's oft-expressed allergy toward Americans, I would not expect that he would be overjoyed to give up, not only the Americans, but the chief attribute of the present line of communications—his surplus, our deficit. But propitiating President de Gaulle has not been precisely a successful exercise for us. His cry is: "Yankee, go home." His present contribution to NATO ground forces is two cadre divisions; there were supposed to be two more divisions when the Algerian crisis was settled, but they have not been forthcoming. The French Navy has been detached from NATO. Our strategic and tactical Air Force, and our nuclear weapons, are banned from French soil. French policy is threatening the exclusion of American farm products from the Common Market, as well as the frustration of the Kennedy round of trade negotiations. Above all, President de Gaulle is using the dollars he obtains from us through our military presence in France as a means of massive gold demands at times and in amounts of his own choosing.

I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that I am raising a delicate subject. I do so because I believe the subject of our financial strength is at least as delicate as the subject of our French line of communications. If we can discuss the one, we can discuss the other. Our military posture is designed to strengthen the whole U.S. posture. Where it weakens our financial position without a compensating military gain, it is surely in the public interest that the matter be fully debated. That is why I have taken the floor this afternoon.

#### WOOL ACT HAS BRANNAN-TYPE PAYMENTS

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, in the Committee on Agriculture today I voted against reporting the bill which extends the National Wool Act until 1969.

The legislation actually authorizes a Brannan-type compensatory payments program.

Under it, income of woolgrowers is supplemented by direct payments financed by U.S. taxpayers. Cost of the program last year was \$27.3 million, and a change in the proposed extension will tend to increase program costs in future years. In 10 years the program has cost taxpayers \$475 million.

When the program was established in 1954, it was heralded as one which would improve farm income and bolster wool production.

While it obviously has transferred cash from the U.S. Treasury to the pockets of woolgrowers, it has not had notable success in bolstering U.S. wool production. Even in the heyday of the mid-fifties when parity income on wool exceeded 100 percent—highest of any commodity—wool production made no significant gain.

A survey I am making in my home district clearly shows my constituents—farm and city alike—are strongly opposed to direct Government payments to supplement farm income. So am I.

Extension of this payments program for 4 more years will simply whet the appetite and strengthen the hand of those wishing to extend direct payments to producers of other commodities. It will deepen the dependency of woolgrowers on handouts from the U.S. Treasury and make more distant the day when U.S. wool production is on a sound competitive basis.

#### VOTING RIGHTS LEGISLATION A MUST—NOW

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a feeling of shame and humiliation that I address the House on the events of this past Sunday in Selma, Ala. A feeling of shame, when I realize there was no protection for American citizens who chose to walk to the State capital of Alabama as a way of asserting their desire and their right by birth to vote. Humiliation, when I realize that we in the Congress have had time to act on legislation which might have avoided this incident. We have failed to act. If other incidents are to be avoided legislation can be delayed no longer.

This past Sunday in Selma will be a day which its citizens will never forget. The years it takes to build good will, the intangible efforts to foster good human relations among citizens—all this can be dissipated in a day. The roots of violence—voter discrimination—has festered through the years. In Selma, and surrounding Dallas County, there are 29,500 persons of voting age. Of these 14,400 are white and 15,115 are Negro. Of the 14,000 white persons, 9,542 are registered to vote. Of the 15,115 Negroes only 335 are registered to vote. Thus, in Dallas County 70 percent of the whites are registered and 2 percent of the Negroes.

How long will Congress and the American people be asked to wait while this administration studies and restudies requests for new Federal legislation to protect voting rights. The need is apparent. The time is now.

This need has been recognized by some of us in the Republican Party. We have

introduced legislation to establish a system of Federal voting registrars.

To the good people who have recognized this problem of voting rights denial go my sympathy and respect.

They must labor once again to replace the substance of a sound and honest community. This is a tough and heartbreaking task. We must not allow the desecration of Selma, Ala., to become an example for community breakdown elsewhere. We must help prevent violence whether in southern communities or northern communities whenever a denial of voting rights is involved.

The good people in these communities need our help. They are committed to equality, but have little power. Now they are taking a public stand with the Negro in his drive for equality. They see and know the deprivation and they have the courage to stand up for equality for both Negro and white members of their communities. The proliferation of new groups such as concerned citizens of Alabama is living proof that genuine concern and efforts do exist. These efforts to protect the constitutional rights of all men are to be admired. But these people cannot be left to battle this problem alone. They can make little progress without Federal legislation which makes abundantly clear the comprehensive and forthright responsibility of the Federal Government in the area of voting rights.

The events in Selma, Ala.—the bullwhips, the tear gas, the flogging of Negro citizens—these events, degrade each of us. For the denial of one man's rights diminishes the rights of all free men. North, South, East, or West, each one of us is intimately bound to this problem; each one of us is responsible in part for its solution. That solution is new Federal voting legislation which eliminates delay, avoids obstruction, and prohibits intimidation. Voting discrimination was clearly the major grievance in Selma. Let Selma be the final place in our land where blood was shed for voting rights. Let it be said that after Selma voting discrimination in our land was ended peaceably by adequate new laws. Proposals for this legislation are now available. Republicans have taken the initiative in introducing legislation for a system of Federal voting registrars. Last month I joined with other Republican Members of Congress to introduce new civil rights legislation providing for the appointment of Federal voting registrars where a Federal district court has found a pattern of voting discrimination to exist. At that time I argued that "recent events in Selma, Ala., clearly demonstrate that Negroes are being denied their rights to register and vote through the use of intimidation and obstruction and intolerable delay."

The new bill provides for appointment of Federal registrars where a Federal district court finds a pattern or practice of discrimination in which at least 50 citizens within a voting district have been denied their right to vote.

If the court fails to find a practice of discrimination or fails to appoint regis-

trars within 40 days, the President would do so if he received affidavits from 50 qualified citizens in the area that they had been denied the right to vote.

The registrars would register qualified citizens within the area and any applicants who had a sixth-grade education would be deemed to comply with all literacy, education, knowledge, or intelligence requirements under the Schweiker bill.

The bill also provides that the Federal registrars would oversee elections in the affected areas and the court would void the election if 50 or more persons in the area were refused permission to vote. Local voting officials who refused to permit persons registered by the Federal registrars to vote could be held in contempt of court.

Mr. Speaker, in light of Sunday's humiliation and near tragedy, I urge the Committee on the Judiciary to hold hearings and report this bill in order that full debate on the House floor and its ultimate passage may be obtained. We must not permit delay any longer in according each of our citizens a right which is his by birth. Let us let Selma be the final chapter in the story of voting discrimination and let us by our actions here open a new era in which voting rights are finally given without hindrance to those who qualify as citizens throughout our land.

#### CONGRESSMAN JAMES KEE

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House an article in which the chairman of the Public Works Committee has praised the work of one of our colleagues from West Virginia, JAMES KEE, for his efforts in connection with the Appalachian bill. I feel the following is a well-deserved tribute:

Congressman JAMES KEE, Democrat, of West Virginia, is one of the most knowledgeable men on the 33-member House Public Works Committee on the problems of Appalachia. Representative GEORGE H. FALLON, Democrat, of Maryland, chairman of the committee, said here today.

The powerful Public Works Committee must implement by legislation the many projects designed to replace poverty with progress in the 355 counties of the 11-State area of Appalachia. FALLON made the comment about the Bluefield Congressman at a seminar for political science students representing colleges of Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. FALLON was asked how he got expert information on the multiplicity of subjects with which he and the Public Works Committee must deal and arrive at decisions. Appalachia was cited as an example.

"Congressman KEE is one of the most knowledgeable members of our Committee on Appalachia," FALLON replied. "I rely on KEE for advice and information because he

literally grew up with the economic and social mishaps of the Appalachia region. His father and his mother represented West Virginia in Congress and were instrumental in bringing the area's grave needs to national attention.

"Congressman KEE can give us firsthand reports from personal observation about conditions and the remedial measures needed for the recovery program. I believe it unique in congressional history that a Member of Congress learned how to be one from his father and mother.

"One of the most cheerful aspects of a bleak picture of Appalachia is the emergence of so much leadership and talent on local and county levels in West Virginia in recent years, as outlined to us by Congressman KEE. What people of West Virginia have done to try to bring about recovery alone, promises well for the program there. KEE's district is typical of Appalachia in many ways. His advice and knowledge is bound to have effect in all Appalachia as well as West Virginia."

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CONYERS, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. RYAN, for 20 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. REUSS, for 20 minutes, today; and to include extraneous matter and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ), for 30 minutes, on March 11; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FINO.

Mrs. SULLIVAN to revise and extend her remarks on H.R. 2 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SKUBITZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINDLEY.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HARRIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HANNA.

Mr. ANNUNZIO.

Mr. HUOT.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. EDMONDSON.

Mr. RONCALIO.

Mr. DENT.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the

following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 45. An act to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 10, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

715. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of audit of Export-Import Bank of Washington, for the fiscal year 1964, pursuant to 31 USC 841 (H. Doc. No. 105); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

716. A letter from the Assistant Executive Officer (Research and Development), Office of Assistant Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on Department of the Army research and development contracts for \$50,000 or more awarded during period July 1, 1964, through December 31, 1964, pursuant to section 4 of Public Law 82-557; to the Committee on Armed Services.

717. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to establish a register of blind persons in the District of Columbia; to provide for the mandatory reporting of information concerning such persons, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

718. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to promulgate special regulations for the period of the American Legion National Convention of 1966, to be held in Washington, D.C., to authorize the granting of certain permits to the American Legion 1966 Convention Corp. of the District of Columbia on the occasion of such convention; and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

719. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

720. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 6(a) of the act of September 30, 1950, relating to conditions of employment of teachers in dependents' schools"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

721. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings by elimination of the requirements for registration, titling, and inspection of Government-owned motor vehicles based in Washington, D.C.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

722. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of unnecessary costs incurred for automatic data processing equipment and services, Manned Spacecraft Center, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

723. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need for basic improvement of accounting system to enable the development of adequate financial information, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

724. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the 30th Annual Report of the Commission for the fiscal year July 1, 1963, to June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 3 of the act of June 29, 1949, and section 11(b) of the Inter-American Development Bank Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

725. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide assistance in training State and local law enforcement officers and other personnel, and in improving capabilities, techniques, and practices in State and local law enforcement and prevention and control of crime, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

726. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled "A bill to make section 1952 of title 18, United States Code, applicable to travel in aid of arson"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER: Committee on Science and Astronautics. Report on Indirect Costs Under Federal Research Grants (Rept. No. 144). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 3708. A bill to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging"; without amendment (Rept. No. 145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 4714. A bill to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964 with respect to the authorization of appropriations therein; without amendment (Rept. No. 146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 5721. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 5984. A bill to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to certain lands granted to the States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 5985. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in Washoe County, Nev., to Mrs. Ralph Haukland; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 5986. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5987. A bill to incorporate the American Academy of Actuaries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONNER:

H.R. 5988. A bill to provide that Commissioners of the Federal Maritime Commission shall hereafter be appointed for a term of 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 5989. A bill to amend section 27, Merchant Marine Act of 1920, as amended (46 U.S.C. 883); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BONNER (by request):

H.R. 5990. A bill to grant increased benefits to persons receiving cash relief under the Panama Canal Cash Relief Act of July 8, 1937, and to extend cash relief benefits to widows of recipients; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 5991. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to make a comprehensive study of certain future highway needs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 5992. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage and handbags, to reduce and eventually repeal the manufacturers excise taxes on passenger automobiles and automotive parts and accessories (with the proceeds going in the meanwhile to the highway trust fund); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H.R. 5993. A bill to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on passenger automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 5994. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communication; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 5995. A bill to encourage the States to extend coverage under their State unemployment compensation laws to agricultural labor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 5996. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 5997. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to require that in the labeling and advertising of certain drugs sold by prescription the "established name" of such drugs must appear each time the proprietary name is used; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 5998. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to grant an additional

income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who has attained age 65 or is blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 5999. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist in combating heart disease, cancer, and stroke, and other major diseases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6000. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the educational quality of schools of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy, to authorize grants under that act to such schools for the awarding of scholarships to needy students, and to extend expiring provisions of that act for student loans and for aid in construction of teaching facilities for students in such schools and schools for other health professions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6001. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a program of grants to assist in meeting the need for adequate medical library services and facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 6002. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6003. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that full benefits (when based upon attainment of retirement age) will be payable to men at age 60 and to women at age 55; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 6004. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 6005. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 by the addition of certain provisions for injunctions against Communist organizations; grand jury investigation of enforcement; priority of trials; more severe punishment in cases of violations by employees on the staffs of the White House, Congress, and Supreme Court; power to deny bail; appropriate supervision of convicts during confinement; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 6006. A bill to prohibit trading in Irish potato futures on commodity exchanges; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H.R. 6007. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the promotion of qualified reserve officers of the Air Force to the reserve grades of brigadier general and major general; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 6008. A bill to create an Independent School Board in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 6009. A bill to provide a program of marine exploration and development of the resources of the Continental Shelf; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 6010. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to require that motion pictures photographed outside the United States, and any advertisements thereof, shall set forth the country of origin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 6011. A bill to protect the integrity of the court and jury functions in criminal cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6012. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, to prohibit Federal agencies from issuing prejudging public statements on pending cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 6013. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 6014. A bill to amend the act approved July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 526), as amended, relating to the establishment of a register of names in the Department of Commerce of certain motor vehicle drivers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 6015. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code with respect to eligibility for pension of certain widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 6016. A bill to provide for the implementation of voting rights, the appointment of Federal registrars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6017. A bill to increase benefits under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to provide child's insurance benefits beyond age 18 while in school, to provide widow's benefits at age 60 on a reduced basis, to provide benefits for certain individuals not otherwise eligible at age 72, to improve the actuarial status of the trust funds, to extend coverage, to improve the public assistance programs under the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6018. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 6019. A bill to adjust wheat and feed grain production, to establish a cropland retirement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 6020. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income the interest on church bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6021. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income the interest on hospital bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 6022. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 6023. A bill to protect the voting rights of U.S. citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 6024. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on general telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 6025. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 20-percent credit against the individual income tax for certain educational expenses incurred at an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 6026. A bill to promote economic growth by supporting State and regional centers to place the findings of science usefully in the hands of American enterprise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 6027. A bill to provide for the implementation of voting rights, the appointment of Federal registrars, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 6028. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to authorize and facilitate the deduction from gross income by teachers of the expenses of education (including certain travel) undertaken by them, and to provide a uniform method of proving entitlement to such deduction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 6029. A bill providing for the enforcement of section 2 of article XIV of the Constitution of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 6030. A bill to provide for a special study and national survey by the Commissioner of Education of progress being made toward providing public school students with an understanding of minority group contributions to our national life; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 6031. A bill to establish a new program of grants for accelerated public works projects undertaken by State and local governments; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H.R. 6032. A bill to amend the act authorizing the Mann Creek Federal reclamation project, Idaho, in order to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for such project (act of Aug. 16, 1962, 76 Stat. 388); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 369. Joint resolution designating March 30 of each year as "Shut-In's Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.J. Res. 370. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.J. Res. 371. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 347. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H. Con. Res. 348. Concurrent resolution to allow the showing in the United States of the U.S. Information Agency film "John F. Kennedy—Years of Lightning, Day of Drums"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H. Con. Res. 349. Concurrent resolution welcoming to the United States the Inter-American Bar Association during its 14th conference to be held in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H. Res. 259. Resolution expressing the sense of the House against the persecution of persons by Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HORTON:

H. Res. 260. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to transfer the responsibilities of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 261. Resolution authorizing cards of identification for certain officers and employees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

82. By Mr. KING of Utah: Memorial of the 1965 regular session of the 36th Legislature of the State of Utah, Gov. Calvin L. Rampton, concurring, requesting the Congress of the United States favorably to consider the Bonneville unit of the central Utah project specifying that funds be appropriated so that construction can begin in fiscal year 1966; to the Committee on Appropriations.

83. By Mr. HATHAWAY: Resolution passed by the 102d Legislature of the State of Maine recommending the full development of the electric power potential of Passamaquoddy Bay and such supplemental development of the electric power potential of the upper St. John River as may be recommended as economically feasible by studies now underway by the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

84. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging immediate action to fulfill the desires of the membership of the Colville Reservation to become American citizens; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

85. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to questioning and protesting the announced closure of the Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Mont.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 6033. A bill for the relief of Camola Pulicono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 6034. A bill for the relief of George H. Beard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 6035. A bill for the relief of the estate of Maj. John W. Roy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 6036. A bill for the relief of Stefania Anc; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 6037. A bill for the relief of the estate of R. M. Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 6038. A bill for the relief of Miss Marija TM Tomasic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 6039. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Harwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 6040. A bill for the relief of Tsin Yee Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.R. 6041. A bill for the relief of Arun Khot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 6042. A bill for the relief of the estates of certain former members of the U.S. Navy Band; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 6043. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Bottone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H.R. 6044. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to adjudicate a claim to certain land in Union, Jackson, and Winn Parishes, La.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 6045. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carmen Prado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 6046. A bill for the relief of Angelina Martino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 6047. A bill for the relief of Maria Lourdes Merza Visaya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 9, 1965

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Reverend William R. Key, minister, Perry Methodist Church, Perry, Ga., offered the following prayer:

"God of our fathers, known of old,  
Lord of our farflung battleline,  
Beneath whose awful hand we hold  
Dominion over palm and pine—  
Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet,  
Lest we forget—lest we forget!"

Lest we forget the Rock from whence we were hewn; lest we forget men of granite, with Bible in hand, who forged the freedom we enjoy; lest we forget the sweat, the blood, and the sacrifice that have bought and maintained this wonderful way of life; lest we forget this powerful Friend, whose smile and blessings our country has long been the recipient of; lest we forget our sacred responsibility to the people of this great Nation and to our whole needy world; lest we forget the example of love and compassion that the Man of Nazareth left us; lest we forget in this particular hour, when misunderstanding is prevalent and hate and strife are evident, that love and compassion yet remain as the sovereign remedy of the Almighty for His children's differences.

In the name of the Christ who taught us to love one another. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 8, 1965, was dispensed with.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the